

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES.

Baltimore, April, 1896.

The Romaunt of the Rose: ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE THAT IT IS CHAUCER'S.

THERE are five poems included in modern editions of Chaucer's works that are now generally recognized as not his. These are *The Cuckoo and the Nightingale*, *The Complaint of a Lover's Life*, *The Flower and the Leaf*, *The Court of Love*, and *Chaucer's Dream*. One other long work, the English version of the famous French poem of the thirteenth century, *Le Roman de la Rose*, which has come down to us as translated by Chaucer, is now the subject of much dispute.

Professor Skeat has inserted an essay in his third edition of the *Prioresses Tale* in which he proves to his satisfaction that this poem cannot be Chaucer's, reasserting this opinion, with some modifications, in his recent edition of Chaucer's complete works. He rests his proof mainly on internal, philological grounds, relating to the vocabulary, to the dialect, to the grammar, and to the rime. To speak exactly, he originally proposed seven tests of this nature, but he has since laid less stress upon some of them, and, following certain German scholars, so modified his opinions as to admit that a short portion of the translation at the beginning may have been and probably was Chaucer's. He still claims, however, that as concerns the remainder, the main body of the translation, his tests hold good.

In his *Studies in Chaucer*, Professor Lounsbury has explained and refuted these tests at the length of more than one hundred and fifty pages. A discussion, either of the tests or of the arguments against them, is not necessary here. One, for example, the "dialect test," upon which Skeat lays particular stress, which he asserts would "alone prove decisive," is shown by Lounsbury to point if anything to a Chaucerian authorship. This is the test arguing from the presence of Northern forms like participles in *-and*, from the use of *til* for *to*, and similarly, in the translated poem. Because these Northern forms, when

found, are essential to the rime and hence in no way chargeable to the scribe, it is the judgment of Skeat that the translator wrote, not in the East Midland dialect, like Chaucer, but in the dialect of the North. If this were a fair statement of the case, the presence of these forms might prove significant, but it is not. If there is a sprinkling of Northern forms in the translation, there is also a sprinkling of Southern. The employment of both is exceptional, and in grammatical peculiarities, such as the verb-ending in the third singular present, the dialect regularly employed is unquestionably the Midland. To quote summarizingly from Professor Lounsbury: When you consider that in the 7700 lines of the poem, there are no more than a possible five cases of the participle in *-and*, which Skeat would lead you to suppose the usual form, and scores and scores of cases of the Midland participle in *-ing*, you see which way the test really points. Because the *-and* words are used as rhyme words shows why they are used at all, for the *-ing* ending would in such cases afford no rime. Add the consideration that this *-and* ending is to be found frequently in manuscripts of poems unquestionably Chaucer's, and you have the matter fairly stated.

This and Skeat's remaining tests thus examined, and all, unless it be the test based on rime and meter, adequately explained, Professor Lounsbury relies mainly for his belief that the translation is Chaucer's on a quantity of positive evidence drawn from matters of style, from parallelisms in language and expression, in uses of words and modes of thought. Whatever may be thought of these parallelisms, which may themselves be paralleled from the works of Gower, or from other poems of the time, or whatever may be the attitude of students towards the genuineness of the translation, Professor Lounsbury has put forth a strong array of arguments, and believes he has shown that henceforth the burden of proof should rest as much with those who deny Chaucerian authorship as with those who affirm it. It must always be remembered, to quote a last time from his discussion, that though there may seem to be

difficulties in the way of the translation's being Chaucer's, there are much greater difficulties in the way of its not being Chaucer's.

There remain other tests which it may be interesting to apply, the tests of sentence-length and sentence-structure. It is not claimed that the results shown by the application of these tests should be necessarily conclusive; they will be left to stand on their own merits. But it is obvious that comparisons of the sets of figures here presented, calculated from Chaucer's genuine writings, from those unquestionably spurious, from the English version of the *Romaunt of the Rose* and from the French original, should throw some light upon the question, either on one side or on the other. It is also obvious that such testimony should have equal weight with that resting on vague theorizing or speculations, or on the uncertain foundations of personal opinion.

A few words in explanation of the tables presented. Throughout in making calculations, a uniform system of punctuation has been adopted in the poems investigated. Any rigorously uniform system would have served the purpose, since it is the relative results, rather than the results in themselves, that are important. Using Skeat's edition of Chaucer, I preferred to adopt and carry out consistently his system of punctuation as shown in his edition of the *Prologue* (Clarendon Press, 1891), reprinted without change in his six volume edition of 1894. Skeat had nothing in view depending for the value of its demonstration on the uniformity of his punctuation, and hence does not always carry out his own principles, varying sometimes within the same poem, sometimes between different poems. In such cases I have repunctuated to render the whole uniform. In the 858 lines of the *Prologue*, some twenty changes were made, carrying out his principle of ending one sentence and beginning another wherever the sense seemed grammatically complete. Thus in the following:

Bifel that, in a seson on a day,
In Southwerk at the Tabard as I lay
Redy to wenden on my pilgrimage
To Caunterbury with ful devout corage,
At night was come unto that hostelrye
Wel nyne and twenty in a companye,

Of sondry folk, by aventure y-falle
In felawshipe, and pilgrims were they alle,
That towards Caunterbury wolden ryde;
The chambres and the stables weren wyde,
And wel we weren esed atte beste,

the semicolon after *ryde* was altered to a period.

The other poems examined were punctuated in the same manner and made uniform with the *Prologue*.

Wherever a sentence is defective in form, that is, without a predicate as in, "But now to purpose" (*Legend of Lucretia*), or "Lo here a deed of man and that a right" (*Legend of Philomela*), it has been omitted from the number of simple sentences, although included in the calculations in other respects. Expressions like *thabsence* or *my self* are treated in accordance with their present forms. In the case of hyphenated words, both parts of the compound are counted separately.

In presenting the results shown in these tables as in any way significant, I am presuming upon two facts already amply demonstrated, the constancy of sentence-lengths in authors (L. A. Sherman, "Some Observations upon the Sentence-Length in English Prose," *University Studies*, published by the University of Nebraska, Vol. i, No. ii, and "On Certain Facts and Principles in the Development of Form in Literature," Vol. i, No. iv), and the constancy of predication averages in authors (G. W. Gerwig, "On the Decrease of Predication and of Sentence-Weight in English Prose," *University Studies*, Vol. ii, No. i). It is not claimed that any particular deductions can be made from the other figures presented, for their value has not yet been investigated. They are included only for completeness in the analysis of the style and sentence-structure of the poems examined.

Investigations in Chaucer's recognized writings show the following:

PROLOGUE.						
Periods.	Words.	Predications.	Simple Sentences.	Initial Conjunctions.	Interior Conjunctions.	
First	100	2193	242	31	18	167
Second	100	1917	210	41	11	162
Third	100	2333	298	20	29	156

Periods.	Words.	Predications.	Simple Sentences.	Initial Conjunctions.	Interior Conjunctions.
Last	7	193	32	0	4
Total	307	6636	782	92	62
Average or per cent a period.		21.61	2.54	.029	.020

KNIGHT'S TALE.

Periods.	Words.	Predications.	Simple Sentences.	Initial Conjunctions.	Interior Conjunctions.
First	100	2345	290	32	32
Second	100	2187	283	20	38
Third	100	2518	322	15	42
Fourth	100	2325	243	32	27
Fifth	100	2348	274	31	35
Sixth	100	1756	197	46	25
Seventh	100	2069	229	29	25
Last	63	1496	180	14	22
Total	763	17044	2018	219	246
Average		22.31	2.64	.028	.030

DETH OF BLAUNCHE.

Periods.	Words.	Predications.	Simple Sentences.	Initial Conjunctions.	Interior Conjunctions.
First	100	2347	323	20	40
Second	100	1924	272	29	21
Third	100	1973	263	23	36
Fourth	100	2177	304	19	29
Last	17	223	35	2	2
Total	417	8644	1197	93	127
Average		20.73	2.87	.022	.030

PARLEMENT OF FOULES.

Periods.	Words.	Predications.	Simple Sentences.	Initial Conjunctions.	Interior Conjunctions.
First	100	2360	270	26	31
Second	100	2208	273	19	36
Last	43	883	131	6	10
Total	243	5451	674	51	77
Average		22.47	2.77	.020	.031

LEGEND OF GOOD WOMEN.

Periods.	Words.	Predications.	Simple Sentences.	Initial Conjunctions.	Interior Conjunctions.
First	100	2583	307	22	46
Second	100	2279	298	17	40
Third	100	2213	282	18	46
Fourth	100	2154	266	24	45
Fifth	100	2133	274	25	32
Sixth	100	2331	299	16	42
Seventh	100	2332	293	19	43
Eighth	100	2388	297	28	44
Ninth	100	2223	291	16	43
Last	35	696	104	11	12
Total	935	21332	2711	196	393
Average		22.81	2.89	.020	.042

These grouped together show the following averages :

Poems.	Words.	Predications.	Simple Sentences.	Initial Conjunctions.	Interior Conjunctions.
<i>Prologue</i>	21.61	2.54	.029	.020	1.60
<i>Knight's Tale</i>	22.31	2.64	.028	.030	1.50
<i>Deth of Blaunche</i>	20.73	2.87	.022	.030	1.32
<i>Parlement of Foules</i>	22.47	2.77	.020	.031	1.10
<i>Legend of Good Women</i>	22.81	2.89	.020	.042	1.52
All Chaucer	22.02	2.76	.024	.033	1.47

The averages for the prologues between the different Canterbury Tales, although undoubtedly Chaucer's latest work, have been omitted. They consist entirely of dialogue, and without other passages to balance, would hardly afford fair examples for the purpose in view.

The group of works generally acknowledged to be spurious, treated similarly, show the following. In examining them the Aldine text was used, since a text of them edited by Skeat has not yet been published.

FLOWER AND LEAF.

Periods.	Words.	Predications.	Simple Sentences.	Initial Conjunctions.	Interior Conjunctions.
First 100	365	594	9	58	291
Last 6	151	22	0	3	8
Total 106	516	616	9	61	299
Average	42.60	5.81	.008	.057	2.82

CUCKOO AND NIGHTINGALE.

Periods.	Words.	Predications.	Simple Sentences.	Initial Conjunctions.	Interior Conjunctions.
91	2488	329	11	39	193
Average	27.31	3.61	.012	.043	2.12

COMPLAINT OF A LOVER'S LIFE.

Periods.	Words.	Predications.	Simple Sentences.	Initial Conjunctions.	Interior Conjunctions.
First 100	3569	330	22	46	228
Last 40	1501	159	5	26	92
Total 140	5070	489	27	72	321
Average	36.21	3.49	.018	.051	2.29

COURT OF LOVE.

Periods.	Words.	Predications.	Simple Sentences.	Initial Conjunctions.	Interior Conjunctions.
First 100	2627	289	23	31	199
Second 100	2724	305	21	24	234
Third 100	2388	297	18	32	188
Fourth 100	2157	320	16	25	185
Last 63	1556	218	11	16	114
Total 463	11452	1429	89	128	920
Average	24.73	3.080	.09	.027	1.98

CHAUCER'S DREAM.

Periods.	Words.	Predications.	Simple Sentences.	Initial Conjunctions.	Interior Conjunctions.
First 100	5033	657	3	40	420
Second 100	5575	701	8	40	484
Last 73	3935	441	1	37	377
Total 273	14543	1799	12	117	1281
Average	53.27	6.58	.004	.042	4.69

Grouped together, these show the following sentence averages:

Poems.	Words.	Predications.	Simple Sentences.	Initial Conjunctions.	Interior Conjunctions.
<i>Flower and Leaf</i>	42.60	5.81	.008	.057	2.82
<i>Cuckoo and Nightingale</i>	27.31	3.61	.012	.043	2.12
<i>Complaint of a Lover's Life</i>	36.21	3.49	.019	.051	2.29
<i>Court of Love</i>	24.73	3.08	.019	.027	1.98
<i>Chaucer's Dream</i>	53.27	6.58	.004	.042	4.69

These are substantially the results one would look for. The averages vary as one would expect in poems coming from different authors. What is to be noted is that none agree with the averages of Chaucer, the discrepancies being especially marked in the case of predication and sentence-lengths. Where Chaucer shows an average of two and a fraction verbs a sentence, these Poems show three and over. The *Court of Love* comes nearer than any of the others to the sentence-length of Chaucer, but shows an average of nearly twenty-five words a sentence, which Chaucer does not reach. The fact that this poem should fall so low even as 24.73 is to be explained by the presence in it of more than the usual quantity of dialogue or broken sentences, and, especially, by the fact that it is probably, as proved by its grammatical forms, the product of later than the fourteenth century (Lounsbury, *Studies in Chaucer*, Vol. i.).

Now to see with which of these two groups belongs the *Romaunt of the Rose*.

ROMAUNT OF THE ROSE.

Periods.	Words.	Predications.	Simple Sentences.	Initial Conjunctions.	Interior Conjunctions.
First 100	2351	304	22	32	184
Second 100	2417	303	22	35	182
Third 100	1747	195	40	19	127
Fourth 100	1890	234	29	35	130
Fifth 100	2219	263	18	47	119
Sixth 100	2080	251	20	50	118
Seventh 100	2169	308	15	37	159
Eighth 100	2015	275	17	41	121
Ninth 100	2239	281	20	33	125

Periods.	Words.	Predications.	Simple Sentences.	Initial Conjunctions.	Interior Conjunctions.
Tenth	100 1966	298	19	21	119
Eleventh	100 2137	290	19	18	129
Twelfth	100 2287	279	22	23	153
Thirteenth	100 2198	283	16	33	131
Fourteenth	100 1847	258	19	27	113
Fifteenth	100 2830	340	15	42	218
Sixteenth	100 2667	354	11	46	213
Seventeenth	100 2126	299	17	37	154
Eighteenth	100 2350	330	13	42	162
Nineteenth	100 2050	278	29	43	138
Twentieth	100 2289	320	21	36	183
Twenty-first	100 2465	324	17	41	197
Twenty-second	100 1920	275	19	35	123
Last	5 100	13	1	2	7
Total	2205 48359	6355	441	775	3305
Averages		21.93	2.88	.019	.030 1.49

This brings us to a final table of comparison.

Chaucer and the *Romaunt of the Rose*.

Periods.	Words.	Predications.	Simple Sentences.	Initial Conjunctions.	Interior Conjunctions.
Chaucer, 2665 periods	22.02	2.76	.024	.033	1.47
<i>Romaunt</i> , 2205 periods	21.93	2.88	.020	.030	1.49

The figures presented in this last table seem significant. The average sentence-length for Chaucer is 22.02, for the *Romaunt of the Rose* 21.93, a remarkably close correspondence. The *Romaunt* shows 2.88 predications and 1.49 interior conjunctions, Chaucer 2.76 predications and 1.47 interior conjunctions a sentence. The agreement is the same with the initial conjunctions, and close with the simple sentences, where the correspondence, that in predications and sentence-length excepted, has most significance. Not only does the *Romaunt of the Rose* fail to show any of the variation from Chaucer's manner, demonstrated in the other poems long attributed to him but now rejected, but it seems to stand on the same literary footing as those

which are Chaucer's beyond dispute. The use of some other text of Chaucer's poems, or the adoption of some other system of punctuation might make changes in the exact figures presented, but could make no change in the relative results.

As elsewhere mentioned, following certain German scholars, Skeat has recently modified his sweeping assertion of the spuriousness of the translation so far as to admit that a small portion at the beginning, which he designates Fragment A, was probably the work of Chaucer. The remainder of the poem he divides into two other fragments, B and C, which he declares not of Chaucerian authorship, and by two different hands. A re-arranging of the figures given, according to this theory shows:

Periods.	Words.	Predications.	Simple Sentences.	Initial Conjunctions.	Interior Conjunctions.
Fragment A, 503 periods	21.22	2.59	.026	.033	1.47
Fragment B, 1190 periods	22.22	2.93	.017	.034	1.46
Fragment C, 537 periods	21.96	3.03	.019	.039	1.58

Variation is shown, but no more than normal; no more, for instance, than in Chaucer's recognized works. One has only to compare these sets of figures with those in the group of spurious works, really the works of different hands, to show that no color is lent to the fragment theory, but the contrary. It may even be wondered that the variation is not more, for the translation of so long a poem as *Le Roman de la Rose*, or even of a fraction of it, could not have been consecutive work. It must have extended over a long period of Chaucer's life, and before its completion have seen many changes of mood and mannerisms that would naturally affect its style.

The sentence-length test is that which deserves particular stress. It has been shown by Professor Sherman that in prose Chaucer wrote a shorter sentence than any of his contemporaries. The same seems to be true of his poetry. Skeat has said that Lydgate is the real author of the *Complaint of a Lover's Life*, which shows an average of about thirty-

six words a sentence. Five hundred periods of Gower show an average of thirty-two.

Gower, *Confessio Amantis*, Book i.

First	Hundred Periods	Average	31.13
Second	" "	"	31.47
Third	" "	"	35.40
Fourth	" "	"	35.36
Fifth	" "	"	0.55
Five	" " General	"	32.78

The sentence-length test verifies and would point, even were no other proofs at hand, to the conclusion that the five works classed as spurious could not be Chaucer's. The same test seems to point just as plainly to the *Romaunt of the Rose* as Chaucer's. Add the correspondence in the number of predications, simple sentences, and conjunctions, and the matter gains increased conclusiveness.

To make the demonstration complete, notice how the figures of the French original compare with those of the translation. Of course if the English version were a literal, word for word, line for line rendering, it is obvious enough that no value should be attached to its sentence-averages, as they would be governed by those of the original. But it is well known that the English poem, though it follows the French with reasonable closeness, is not really a translation but a paraphrase. In many places it expands the idea contained in the original; in many places it condenses or omits it. Sometimes the forms of expression or the language used, owe nothing to the French save bare suggestion. Again there is transposition or inversion. One would not expect, then, the sentence-length to be ruled by that of the original, or to be identical with it. As a matter of fact, it is not, as will be readily seen.

Le Roman de la Rose, Part i. Guillaume de Lorris.

First	Hundred Periods	Average	19.95
Second	" "	"	21.05
Third	" "	"	15.90
Fourth	" "	"	17.34
Fifth	" "	"	23.64
Sixth	" "	"	18.42
Seventh	" "	"	19.10
Eighth	" "	"	18.71
Ninth	" "	"	19.19

Tenth Hundred Periods	Average	18.32
Eleventh " "	"	19.94
Twelfth " "	"	18.39
Remaining 34	"	7.81
Total 1234	" 23,776 words	19.26

From this it is plain that the sentence-length of the English version is the sentence-length of the translator, not of Guillaume de Lorris. Hence the sentence-length of the translator may be compared justly enough with Chaucer's averages or with the averages in the poems known not to be genuine. This was, perhaps, evident enough already, for, as said elsewhere, the translation is not so much a translation as a paraphrase, closely following the original and equalling it in literary merit, but not literally rendering it. Still, additional evidence is not to be disregarded. As was to be expected, the difference of the English from the French is one of expansion.

The short sentence-length of the French is to be noted, Guillaume de Lorris showing two or three words less a sentence than Chaucer, who nevertheless wrote a shorter sentence than any Englishman of his time. It is to be doubted whether the French ever wrote so ponderously as did the English at this period. The subject yet remains to be investigated, but if De Lorris be a fair example, the sentence-sense in French literature was then further developed than it was in English for some centuries.

In conclusion, it would seem that henceforward it is for those who pronounce the translation spurious to prove their position, not for those who believe it genuine. It is within the bounds of possibility that some one else may have had the same sentence averages as Chaucer; but such a supposition is far from probable, and until such an individual is produced, the results presented here should seem decisive. It is remarkable enough that there should have been one author who was to stand ahead of his contemporaries so far as Chaucer. That there should have been two, and that the name of the second should not have survived, seems more than we should be asked to believe.

LOUISE POUND.

University of Nebraska.

GOETHE AND DIDEROT ON ACTORS AND ACTING.

THE theatrical career of Wilhelm Meister in Goethe's novel forms such a prominent feature of it, and occasions, in the novel, such well-marked, characteristic and apparently original remarks on the art of the actor and of acting, that one is naturally induced to ask: How did the author come to make this feature so prominent?

The common answer to this question is that Goethe had not only given much attention to dramatic composition, but had also practically conducted a theater, so that he could not help taking a direct and vivid interest in all that pertained to the theater, and especially the art of acting itself. This is very well, but does not, after all, account for the very peculiar treatment this matter receives in the novel. For Wilhelm Meister is not an actor, though he does appear a few times on the stage in the quality of an actor, and the whole of his experience in connection with the theater amounts really only to a forcible disillusion. He discovers at last that he has made a mistake, that nature had intended him for other work, and that his experience as an actor was of the nature of a disease peculiar to childhood, which he had unwittingly caught, and through which he had luckily passed without permanent injury.

It is easy to see that Wilhelm, as long as he applied himself to learning and exercising the trade of an actor, appeared as a striking representative of dilettantism. R. M. Meyer, in an article in *Euphorion* (October, 1885), calls him the "born dilettante."

This may be going too far. Wilhelm is no more a natural dilettante than Goethe himself.

The poet, in a well-known epigram, makes fun of himself for having dabbled in many arts, while approaching mastery only in one, that is, in the art of writing German. The evident significance of Wilhelm's career, in the *Lehrjahre*, consists rather in this, that his early education had been a mistake; that he had been allowed to follow solely the impulses of his heart, instead of being trained to overcome impulse by a systematic cultivation of

his reasoning faculties. Wilhelm was what the French call *sensible*, a word which generally, though not always, corresponds to the English 'emotional.' His *sensibilité* shows itself early, not only in his love for Marianna, but in his partiality for the picture of the sick prince; later in the deep sympathy he feels for the unhappy couple of lovers (Book i, Chap. 13), and throughout his relations to his friend Werner, whenever the latter's matter-of-fact view of looking at things arouses Wilhelm's opposition.

It appears in the sequel, and in a higher degree, when he centers his affection on poor Mignon and the old Minstrel; when he becomes the confidant of Aurelia; when he so readily offers to help Lothario who has won his friendship and admiration, by taking upon himself the peculiar errand that leads to his making the acquaintance of Theresa who is in every essential his exact opposite, and especially in her freedom from *sensibilité*, and whom he nevertheless offers to marry, believing that the unknown stranger who had won his heart is beyond his reach.

But, while all this happens, he is still a very young man. There is no reason to believe that a young man so well endowed will continue forever in this blundering manner of life. His mistakes teach him important lessons, and he is an apt scholar. Therefore, while he is a dilettante, he is a dilettante only from lack of proper training. As soon as he has had this training, he sees the errors into which his impulses and emotional nature have led him; he finds that his real vocation is that of a surgeon, and with this discovery the essential part of the story has reached its legitimate end.

To return now to our question, if we remember the emotional nature of the hero of the novel, we may discover both in this character and in the remarks on actors and acting that occur in the story, the influence of an author whom Goethe prized highly: Diderot.

I have not been able to find in Goethe's published works a distinct recognition of his having read Diderot's *Paradoxe sur le comédien*, but when we bear in mind that the poet was supplied by Grimm, the friend of Diderot, with all the novelties in literature as

soon as they appeared in Paris, Grimm being the special literary correspondent of the court of Gotha and thus on a familiar footing also with Weimar; that Goethe visited Grimm repeatedly and met him often in Weimar, we can scarcely doubt that the 'Schauspieldirector' Goethe was acquainted with a treatise that could not fail to attract his special attention.

An example of the eagerness with which Grimm served his friends is found, for instance, in the fact that he furnished Goethe a copy of the manuscript of Voltaire's notorious libel on Frederick the Great long before it appeared in print. He, probably, also procured him the manuscript of Diderot's *Neveu de Rameau*, which was long thought to be the only one existing. We may further recall the circumstance that throughout his long life Goethe continued to be deeply interested in Diderot, from the time when as a student seventeen years old he played at Leipzig a part in Diderot's *Hausvater*, translated by Lessing, to the time when in old age he wrote to his friend Zelter:

"Diderot is Diderot, a unique individual; he who finds fault [*makelt an*] with his writings is a Philistine, and of them there are legions. For men do not know how to receive gratefully what is above prize, either from God, or from Nature, or their fellowmen." (Cf. Riemer, *Briefwechsel zwischen Goethe und Zelter*, vi, 161.)

We may also recall here his translation of Diderot's essay on Painting (see G. W. Hempel's edition, xxviii, pp. 47-102), and the frequent mention he makes of the French author in various parts of his works.

It would be strange if with such opportunities, and with such a profound interest in the man, Goethe should have failed to be attracted by one of Diderot's most characteristic productions, which by its content and treatment appealed so strongly to him in his efforts to advance the interests of the stage, and the proper cultivation of actors.

If a doubt still exists it will, I think, disappear if we subject those portions of *Wilhelm Meister's Lehrjahre* which refer to acting and actors, to a careful comparison with Diderot's treatise.

Diderot entitled his treatise a *Paradoxe*.

The paradox consists in the proposition that an actor in so far as he is emotional, that is, *sensible*, cannot be a good actor; and that the best actor is one who is entirely free from *sensibilité*. This is his thesis, and he works it out with great skill and persistency. Whether or not Goethe may have caught here the idea of representing this thesis in an artistic form in the character of Wilhelm Meister, it would be difficult to determine, in the absence of a positive statement to this effect on the part of the poet. But that his representation virtually amounts to this can scarcely be doubted.

The influence of Diderot upon Goethe which I shall discuss is specific, and limited strictly to the question of what constitutes a good actor. I recognize fully that in Goethe's plan of the work Wilhelm's false tendency might easily have been represented in another form; that what he says of Wilhelm's error would apply as well to any other error; for instance, that of a born actor who should be tempted to try a military or a legal career. The radical and fundamental error of Wilhelm is not that he turns an actor, but that he follows impulse, allows an accident to determine his course of action, and is always ready to waste his time when his feelings become excited. He thus represents human nature, for we are all made that way, and we all have made, or are making, mistakes more or less resembling those of Wilhelm. But Wilhelm is a concrete individual, not a type, or an abstraction. Therefore he is made to follow a definite career, to make mistakes due to definite circumstances, and to proceed, while true to his character, in a line specifically his own and distinctly adapted to him.

In other words: Wilhelm is an artistic creation of one of the greatest masters in literature, and the originality of this creation could not be questioned, even if it should appear that some of the views brought out in the progress of it had been held by another, and are therefore not entirely original. In writing *Wilhelm Meister*, Goethe's intention was not to communicate to the world his thoughts on actors and acting, but to use the career and qualifications of an actor as a means to illustrate a fundamental truth in a life-like and

artistic form.

The key-note of the whole work is found, I think, in the remarks of the Stranger in Book i, Chap. 17. The stranger had referred to the fine picture gallery of Wilhelm's grandfather which Wilhelm was too young to appreciate when it was sold. But he still remembered a rather inferior picture on account of what it represented. Hereupon the stranger remarked:

"These feelings are of course widely remote from those considerations which affect a lover of art when he inspects the works of great masters. Very likely, however, if the collection had remained in your house, there would have dawned in you, by degrees, the appreciation [*der Sinn*] of the works themselves, so that you would not have always seen in the works of art only yourself and your inclination."

"Certainly, I was very sorry on account of the sale of the pictures at the very time, and I have also missed them much in more mature years. But when I consider that it had to be so, as it were, in order that there might be developed in me a fancy [*Liebhabeerei*] or a talent which was destined to affect my life very much more than those lifeless pictures could have done, I willingly resign myself and reverently bow to fate which knows how to bring about what is best for me and best for every one."

"I regret to hear the word fate used for the second time by a young man who is just at an age when one is accustomed to look upon one's own lively inclinations as the will of higher beings."

"Then you don't believe in fate? in a power which rules over us and directs everything for the best?"

"The question here is not about my belief, nor is this the place to interpret how I try to make to some extent thinkable for myself things which are incomprehensible to us all: the question here is solely, which way of looking at things is to our best interest. The tissue of this world is fashioned of necessity and chance; the reason of man steps between the two and knows how to govern them; it treats the necessary as the foundation of its existence; it knows how to direct, to guide and to use the accidental, and only if it stands firm and immovable does man deserve to be called a god of the earth. Woe to him who has accustomed himself from his youth to wish to find something arbitrary in the necessary, who would like to attribute to the accidental a kind of reason which it were a sort of religion to obey. Is this anything else than to renounce one's own intellect and to give absolute control to one's inclination? We

imagine that we are leading a pious life when we saunter along without reflexion, allow ourselves to be determined by an agreeable chance, and, finally, give to the result of such an unsteady life the name of a divine guidance."

The passage confirms what could scarcely be doubted anyhow; namely, that Goethe presents in Wilhelm Meister a young man whose character falls under the category of what the French call *cœurs sensibles*.

But the profound idea of Goethe in presenting such a character is still more clearly shown in the following passage which, though well known, it will be useful to consider in this connection.

"Let no one believe that he is able to overcome the first impressions of his youth. If he has grown up in a laudable freedom, surrounded by beautiful and noble objects, in intercourse with good men; if his teachers taught him what he should know first, in order to comprehend the more easily the rest; if he has learned what he never needs to unlearn; if his first acts were so guided that he can, in the future, perform the good more easily and more comfortably without being compelled to disaccustom himself from anything: such a man will lead a purer, more perfect and a happier life than another who has used up his original youthful energy in resistance and error. So much is said and written about education, but I see few people who are able to comprehend this simple, but grand idea, and to put it into execution." (Book ii, Chap. 9.)

In a conversation with his friend Werner Wilhelm expresses himself in a manner which must almost make us believe that he knows his own weakness much better than anyone else. He is destroying his youthful poems and other writings, and says to Werner:

"I furnish a proof that I am in earnest about giving up a business for which I was not born."

"But why should these efforts be destroyed, even if they are not excellent?" "Because, a poem should be excellent, or it must not exist, for every one ought to take serious care to refrain from an art for which he has no talent, and to guard against any temptation to practise that art."

He adds to this the striking remark that there is in every one an indefinite desire to imitate what he sees others do, be it the skill of the circus rider, or that of the virtuoso on an instrument. "Happy he who soon perceives

the sophistry of an inference as to his capacities drawn from his desires."

But, though he sees the general truth of his remark, he fails to make the proper application. The early puppetshow, his love for the actress Marianne, and a natural delight in dramatic representations, have aroused and fostered in him the belief that his vocation is the stage. His heart warms to the idea of being a benefactor to his people by presenting to them in an impressive manner the great productions of dramatic genius.

But it is precisely this warmth of his heart in the presence of the art that makes all his attempts at true success in that art nugatory. As if to show us with absolute distinctness that this is his conception of this character, Goethe puts Wilhelm in contrast with Serlo, the born actor, the man whose heart is cold, who has no trace of *sensibilité*, but who observes, imitates, and succeeds.

Let us now turn to Diderot's *Paradoxe* (*Œuvres choisies* de Diderot. Firmin-Didot frères. Paris, 1874. Tome i). The italics are mine.

"Le point important sur lequel nous avons des opinions tout-à-fait opposées, votre auteur et moi, ce sont les *qualités premières d'un grand comédien*. Moi, je lui veux beaucoup de *jugement*; il me faut dans cet homme un *spectateur froid et tranquille*; j'en exige, par conséquent, de la *pénétration* et *nulle sensibilité*, l'*art de tout imiter*, ou, ce qui revient au même, une *égale aptitude à toutes sortes de caractères et de rôles*." (l. c. p. 217.)

As for 'judgment' and 'penetration,' Aurelia informs Wilhelm (Book iv, Chap. 16):

"I have hardly ever seen any one who knows so little the men with whom he lives, who so thoroughly misjudges them as you. Allow me to say what I think of you. When one hears you explain Shakespeare, one believes you have just come from the council of the gods, and that you have heard them discuss the problem of forming men; but when you associate with people, I see in you, so to speak, the very first born adult child of creation that, with peculiar wonder and an edifying good nature, looks amazed at lions and apes, sheep and elephants, and addresses them in simple faith as though they were of his own species just because they too exist and move about."

The contrast between Wilhelm and Serlo is so striking, Serlo answers so closely to Diderot's definition of a great actor, while the case

of Wilhelm forcibly illustrates the other side of Diderot's view; namely, that a great actor must have *nulle sensibilité*, that we may not unreasonably conclude that the artistic creation of Goethe exactly corresponds to the abstract conception of Diderot.

That Wilhelm failed to impress his audience favorably in the long run is repeatedly intimated or distinctly stated. In Book iii, Chap. 8, Wilhelm appears greatly vexed that his persistent efforts did not meet with the applause he most desired. At first the prince had staid out the performances, but he soon withdrew at the first opportunity. It was similarly so with the more intelligent portion of the other spectators. And yet, we are told, "Wilhelm memorized his parts diligently and presented them with warmth and vivacity." This "warmth and vivacity" forms a clear contrast to Diderot's *froid et tranquille*.

The first impression of Serlo's acting (Book iv, Chap. 15), is conveyed in the following language:

"One soon felt that Serlo was the soul of the whole, and he distinguished himself very much to his advantage. A *serene* good humor, a *tempered* vivacity, an *assured feeling of propriety* together with a *great talent of imitation*, one could not help admiring as soon as he stepped on the stage, as soon as he opened his mouth. . . . The inward feeling of comfortable existence [*Die innere Behaglichkeit seines Daseins*] seemed to spread over all his hearers, and the ingenious manner [*geistreiche Art*] with which he expressed easily and pleasingly the most delicate shades of his parts, produced so much the more enjoyment as he knew how to hide the art which he had acquired by persistent practice."

Diderot, after speaking of actors who "play themselves," which explains their inequality [*l'inégalité des acteurs qui jouent d'âme*], says of the true actor (l. c. p. 218):

"Le comédien qui jouera de réflexion, d'étude de la nature humaine, d'imitation constante d'après quelque modèle d'idéal, d'imagination, de mémoire, sera un, le même à toutes les représentations, toujours également parfait: tout a été mesuré, combiné, appris, ordonné dans sa tête; . . . *s'il y a quelque différence* d'une représentation à l'autre, c'est ordinairement à l'avantage de la dernière. . . . Ainsi que le poète il va sans cesse puiser dans le fonds inépuisable de la nature; au lieu qu'il aurait bientôt vu le terme de sa propre richesse."

And, as if to give us the prototype of Serlo (or of his sister Aurelia), Diderot says;

"Quel jeu plus parfait que celui de la Clairon? cependant suivez-la, étudiez-la, et vous verrez qu'à la sixième représentation elle sait par cœur tous les détails de son jeu comme tous les mots de son rôle. Sans doute elle s'est fait un modèle. . . Quand, à force de travail, elle a approché de cette idée de plus près qu'elle a pu, tout est fini; se tenir ferme là, c'est une pure affaire d'exercice et de mémoire." (*l. c.*, p. 218.)

We learn more about Serlo in Chap. 18 of Book iv, how he improved by repetition, by imitation of models which he soon excelled, by perfect self-control, appearing to be carried away, while all the time watching the effect of his play.

"Durch eine seltsam scheinende, aber ganz natürliche Wirkung und Gegenwirkung stieg durch Einsicht und Übung seine Rezitation, Deklamation und sein Gebärdenspiel zu einer hohen Stufe von Wahrheit, Freiheit und Offenheit, indem er im Leben und Umgang immer heimlicher, künstlicher, ja verstellt und ängstlich zu werden schien."

This is exactly what Diderot means. He does not weary to point out the difference between a person's natural tones and gestures when he acts under an impulse, and the artistic representation of the same by an artist who feels nothing, but imitates carefully, and succeeds, by dint of close study and long practice, to realize his idea.

"Mais quoi! dira-t-on, ces accents si plaintifs, si douloureux, que cette mère arrache du fond de ses entrailles, et dont les miennes sont si violemment secouées, ce n'est pas le sentiment actuel qui les produit, ce n'est pas le désespoir qui les inspire? Nullement; et la preuve, c'est qu'ils sont mesurés; qu'ils font partie d'un système de déclamation; que, plus bas ou plus aigus de la vingtième partie d'un quart de ton, ils sont faux; qu'ils sont soumis à une loi d'unité; qu'ils sont, comme dans l'harmonie, préparés et sauvés; qu'ils ne satisfont à toutes les conditions requises que par une longue étude; qu'ils concourent à la solution d'un problème proposé; que, pour être poussés justes, ils ont été répétés cent fois, et que, malgré ces fréquentes répétitions, on les manque encore. C'est qu'avant de dire, Zaire, vous pleurez! ou, Vous y serez ma fille, l'acteur s'est longtemps écouté lui-même; c'est qu'il s'écoute au moment où il vous trouble, et que tout son talent consiste non pas à sentir, comme vous le supposez, mais à rendre si scrupuleusement les signes extérieurs

du sentiment, que vous vous y trompiez. Les cris de sa douleur sont notés dans son oreille. Les gestes de son désespoir sont de mémoire, et ont été préparés devant une glace. Il sait le moment précis où il tirera son mouchoir et où les larmes couleront; attendez les à ce mot, à cette syllabe, ni plus tôt ni plus tard. Ce tremblement de la voix, ces mots suspendus, ces sons étouffés ou traînés, ce frémissement des membres, ce vacillement des genoux, ces évanouissements, ces fureurs, pure imitation, leçon recordée d'avance, grimace pathétique, singerie sublime etc., etc." (*l. c.* p. 221-222.)

The Horatian rule *Si vis me flere* etc. (Ep. ad. Pisones, ll. 102 sq.)¹ is thus reversed by Diderot. Goethe, by opposing a real actor like Serlo to a dilettante like Wilhelm, expresses the same idea, enforces the same truth as Diderot.

The difference between the real character of Serlo and the character he assumed in his play is strongly emphasized by Goethe; but Diderot is much more emphatic in presenting the same idea. He introduces an actor and an actress, who are actually husband and wife, as they play the third scene of the fourth act of Molière's *Dépit amoureux*. They act and play Molière perfectly, but at the same time keep up a private conversation, the one speaking in an under tone while the other recites Molière's verses; the husband calling his wife insulting names, and the wife replying correspondingly. On leaving the stage the lover, as actor, escorts his mistress, but the husband presses his wife's arm with such violence as to wrench off part of her skin. (*l. c.*, 227-229.)

The trouble with Wilhelm was that he felt what he said on the stage; his was not merely an objective study based on observation and imitation, but he put his soul into his play, he played himself. When playing Hamlet, the first representation had proved a success, but when the play was repeated it does not seem as though Wilhelm's acting was particularly noticed. He had the mortification of overhearing a conversation in which one of the speakers confounded him with Laertes, praising Laertes, while finding fault with the actor who played the part assigned to Wilhelm. (Book v, Ch. 15.) His success in the part of Hamlet was due to the circumstance that it fitted his own character; there was no urgent

¹ That is, if Horace meant real feeling by his *dolendum est primum ipsi tibi*, which is by no means certain.

necessity of denying this character. But his diminishing success at the repetitions of the same play makes us think of the following remark of Diderot (*l. c.*, p. 217):

"Si le comédien était sensible, de bonne foi lui serait-il permis de jouer deux fois de suite un même rôle avec la même chaleur et le même succès? Très-chaud à la première représentation, il serait épuisé et froid comme un marbre à la troisième. Au lieu qu'imitateur attentif et disciple réfléchi de la nature, la première fois qu'il se présentera sur la scène sous le nom d'Auguste, de Cinna, d'Orosmane, d'Agamemnon, de Mahomet, copiste rigoureux de lui-même ou de ses études, et observateur continu de nos sensations, son jeu, loin de s'affaiblir, se fortifiera des réflexions nouvelles qu'il aura recueillies; il s'exaltera ou se tempérera, et vous en serez de plus en plus satisfait. S'il est lui quand il joue, comment cessera-t-il d'être lui? S'il veut cesser d'être lui, comment saisira-t-il le point juste auquel il faut qu'il se place et s'arrête?"

It is evident that in this remark the characters of Wilhelm and Serlo are clearly foreshadowed in all that regards their theatrical career and success.

The identity of the views of Diderot and Goethe on this subject appears more clearly still from some remarks put in the mouth of Jarno. In Book vii, Chap. 3, Wilhelm gives Jarno his opinion of the players he has met: The description is not flattering, for the speaker is full of indignation. Jarno interrupts him with immoderate laughter:

"The poor players! he says at last. Do you know, my friend, that you have described, not the people of the stage, but the world?—Pardon me, I must laugh, if you believe that these fine qualities are limited to the theater. . . Indeed, I pardon in the actor every fault that results from self-deception and the desire to please, for if he does not seem to be something to himself and others, he is nothing. His vocation is *to seem*;—he must try to shine, for that is his business. All the faults of the man I pardon in the actor; no faults of the actor I pardon in the man."

Goethe's language differs from that of Diderot, but his idea is the same as Diderot's.

On his return to Serlo (Book vii, Chap. 8), Wilhelm finds that his rôles had meanwhile been taken by Laertes and Horatio: "both won from the spectators a far more vivid applause than he had ever been able to obtain." We ask why? Was not Wilhelm's nature far more

poetical than that of either of the others? Had he not entered with far more love and devotion into the spirit of the author? Was he not graceful in his person, well-formed, prepossessing? Had he not always carefully committed his part, and spoken it on the stage 'with warmth and feeling?'

In Book vii, Chap. 5, Jarno expresses himself still more forcibly. Wilhelm had said:

"Pardon me, you have severely enough denied me every capacity as an actor. I confess to you that, although I have completely renounced this art, I cannot possibly admit such an utter incapacity in my case." "And in my mind, there is absolutely no possibility of a doubt that *he who can play only himself is no actor*. He who cannot, both as to meaning and to form change himself into many personalities, does not merit this name."

He admits that Wilhelm played Hamlet and a few other parts quite well,

"being favored by his natural character, form and momentary mood. This would be good enough for an amateur theater and for any one who could see no other way before himself."

As Goethe in Serlo, so Diderot gives us in Garrick a sample of an ideal actor:

"Garrick passe sa tête entre les deux battants d'une porte, et, dans l'intervalle de quatre à cinq secondes, son visage passe successivement de la joie folle à la joie modérée, de cette joie à la tranquillité, de la tranquillité à la surprise, de la surprise à l'étonnement, de l'étonnement à la tristesse, de la tristesse à l'abattement, de l'abattement à l'effroi, de l'effroi à l'horreur, de l'horreur au désespoir, et remonte de ce dernier à celui d'où il était descendu. Est-ce que son âme a pu éprouver toutes ces sensations, et exécuter de concert avec son visage, cette espèce de gamme? Je n'en crois rien, ni vous non plus. Si vous demandiez à cet homme célèbre, qui lui seul méritait autant qu'on fît le voyage d'Angleterre que tous les restes de Rome méritent qu'on fasse le voyage d'Italie; si vous lui demandiez, dis-je, la scène du Petit Garçon pâtissier, il vous la jouait; si vous lui demandiez tout de suite la scène d'Hamlet, il vous la jouait, également prêt à pleurer la chute de ses petits pâtés, et à suivre dans l'air le chemin d'un poignard."

With this may be compared the following from *William Meister's Lehrjahre* (Book iv, Chap. 18).

"He [Serlo] grew up and showed extraordinary capacities of the mind, and skill of the body, and, along with these, a great flexibility

both in style and conception and in acts and gestures. His gifts of imitation passed belief. When a mere boy he already imitated persons so perfectly that one imagined to see them, although they were perfectly unlike him and dissimilar in shape, age and character."

The total absence of *sensibilité* in Serlo is emphasized (*l. c.*):

"Being cold of heart and feeling, he loved in reality no one; the clearness of his observation made it impossible for him to esteem any one; for he saw always only the outward peculiarities of men and transferred them into his mimic collection."

We are here again reminded of Diderot's demand that an actor must be "cold and calm" that he must have penetration, but no *sensibilité*, and that he must possess "the art of imitating everything."

Diderot has drawn no character of his own invention to illustrate his conception of an imperfect actor, but he gives, nevertheless, some illustrations that form a parallel to those of Goethe, and suggested to Goethe, as I feel compelled to think, some of the characteristic features of his Wilhelm.

He introduces an actress, Mme. Riccoboni (*l. c.*, pp. 239 sq.). She is the author of a number of works that are charming, full of genius, delicacy and grace. She shows both in her works and in her conduct that she is *sensible*, that is, emotional, and impulsive.

"A sad incident in her life came near driving her to the grave. For twenty years her tears had not ceased to flow. Well! This woman, one of the most emotional that nature has formed, has been one of the *worst actresses* who have ever appeared on the stage. *No one talks better about the art, no one plays worse.* She knows it and does not complain of the marks of disapprobation she receives from the public. And yet she has a good face, she is witty; she *carries herself becomingly*; her voice has nothing disagreeable. She possessed *all the good qualities that education can give.* In society she was all that could be desired. She is scarcely noticed, but *when she speaks, people listen with the greatest pleasure.*—And yet she failed as an actress.—*It is because she constantly remained herself that the public constantly refused to like her.*

If we bear in mind that Wilhelm's fate as an actor, indicated in the novel, would have been the same as Madame Riccoboni's if he had continued on the stage, we see that, in every essential respect, Wilhelm's character furnishes

an exact parallel to that of Diderot's Madame Riccoboni. Wilhelm was supremely emotional and impulsive; he never ceased to shed tears over that early disappointment which had brought him to the verge of the tomb; he had a fine figure, a sympathetic voice; when he talked, people listened with pleasure; he was well educated, he had engaged in literary work, he behaved with propriety and grace, *but he could play only himself.* Like Madame Riccoboni he talks well about the art, but he is not an actor. Jarno's criticism fits him, and Jarno speaks exactly like Diderot.

I pointed out in my opening remarks, that Diderot has written a thesis which he felt bound to defend. Nothing of the kind is found in Goethe. The reflections interspersed in the novel spring naturally from the situation and the character of the speakers. For this reason in order to make a comparison satisfactory, it is necessary to study the characters and the situations in Goethe quite as particularly as the remarks that bear on our subject. And, of course, it is understood that Goethe's aim was a much higher one, and that our comparison touches only a special feature of his work. On the other hand, we must admit that Goethe undoubtedly learned much from Diderot, for this writer was one of the most suggestive in the whole range of French literature; an acute observer, a close reasoner in specific lines, endowed with an immense power of mental acquisition, an excellent memory and a penetrating intellect. That Goethe undertook the translation of Diderot's *Neveu de Rameau*, the subject of which is largely music, in which Goethe was only slightly interested, proves that he appreciated the peculiar qualities of this rare mind; and the fact that he was acquainted with this composition which for many years was accounted lost, adds force to the argument that he must have been acquainted also with Diderot's other writings, and surely with one so much in line with his own observations, as the *Paradoxe sur le Comédien*.

After every allowance is made the following facts will be found to stand out very clearly:

Diderot's Garrick and Riccoboni correspond to Goethe's Serlo and Wilhelm Meister.

Diderot insists that an actor must not be emotional (while, of course, granting that he may have emotions independently of his character as an artist); that he must be a cool observer, a good imitator, possessed of penetrating intellect, and diligent in practice and repetition.

Goethe shows that Serlo is just such an actor, that every one of these conditions is fulfilled in his case, and that he possesses these very qualities in the highest degree.

Diderot states that the emotional and impulsive character is not fit for the stage, nor for any artistic calling (cf. *l.c.*, p. 220, ll. 16-20) because such a person can play and represent only himself.

Goethe makes his Jarno say almost the same, and he shows that he thinks exactly as Diderot in his treatment of the character and career of Wilhelm.

It would be interesting to trace relations between Diderot's thoughts and Goethe's in some other respects.

While Goethe seems to attribute to Diderot an excessive regard for 'naturalness' on the stage, in the remark in *Aus meinem Leben*, Book iii (Weimar Edition, p. 148), we find that Diderot, in the article which I have here considered, is very emphatic in discriminating between the *truth of art* and the *truth of nature*. What he says (*l.c.*, pp. 225 sq.) anticipates Goethe's own views, and while I do not think that Goethe borrowed these views from Diderot, I must, on the other hand, admit that Goethe was not quite just to Diderot in that remark. Diderot says:

"Réfléchissez un moment sur ce qu'on appelle au théâtre être vrai. Est-ce montrer les choses comme elles sont en nature? *Aucunement. Le vrai, en ce sens, ne serait que le commun.* Qu'est-ce donc que le vrai de la scène? C'est la conformité des actions, de la figure, de la voix, du mouvement, du geste, avec un modèle idéal imaginé par le poète, et souvent exagéré par le comédien. . . . De là vient que le comédien dans la rue ou sur la scène sont deux personnages si différents, qu'on a peine à les reconnaître" (pp. 225 sq.).

Goethe, in the remark referred to, speaks of a time when

"according to Diderot's principles and examples the most natural naturalness was demanded on the stage, and a complete illusion

was considered the proper end of theatrical art.

The passage quoted above shows, however, that Goethe and Diderot agree, for Goethe says, in different language and in regard to a different subject, essentially the same as Diderot. In *Aus meinem Leben*, Book xi, p. 76, we read:

"The highest mission of every art is to produce by appearance the illusion of a higher reality. On the other hand, it is a false endeavor to realize the appearance so long until at last *only a common reality remains.*"

Diderot had said: "The *true*, in this sense, *would be only the common.*"

In a well-known passage, Goethe defends himself against the charge of a lack of patriotism during the period of the German wars of liberation. One of his defenses is "that he could not hate the French to whom he (and the rest of his nation) owed such a large portion of their culture." That Goethe admired Diderot is apparent from the quotation in the beginning of this article; that he was, to a greater or less degree, influenced in his own thinking and writing by the French author, seems to admit of scarcely a doubt, and that this influence is particularly striking in his *Wilhelm Meister*, will be granted, unless I am greatly mistaken, by all who will take the trouble of verifying the statements of this paper.

C. A. EGGERT.

University of Chicago.

A SUGGESTION ON LESSING'S KEIN MENSCH MUSS MUESSEN.¹

Wie gar noch heute jemand in Lessing einen Anhänger der Willensfreiheit erblicken kann, scheint den Urkunden gegenüber mehr als paradox.²

Lessing zieht die Konsequenz aus Leibniz' System, wenn er die Willensfreiheit leugnet.³

Instead of quoting or referring to the numerous passages in Lessing's own writings which would uphold the above quotations from Schmidt and Zeller, it is sufficient to make

¹ *Nathan der Weise*, I. 385.

² Erich Schmidt, *Lessing*, Vol. II, 2nd part (that is, of vol. II), p. 626.

³ Zeller, *Lessing als Theolog*, in Von Sybel's *Historische Zeitschrift*, Vol. XXIII, pp. 343 ff. See pp. 362-363.

both in style and conception and in acts and gestures. His gifts of imitation passed belief. When a mere boy he already imitated persons so perfectly that one imagined to see them, although they were perfectly unlike him and dissimilar in shape, age and character."

The total absence of *sensibilité* in Serlo is emphasized (*l. c.*):

"Being cold of heart and feeling, he loved in reality no one; the clearness of his observation made it impossible for him to esteem any one; for he saw always only the outward peculiarities of men and transferred them into his mimic collection."

We are here again reminded of Diderot's demand that an actor must be "cold and calm" that he must have penetration, but no *sensibilité*, and that he must possess "the art of imitating everything."

Diderot has drawn no character of his own invention to illustrate his conception of an imperfect actor, but he gives, nevertheless, some illustrations that form a parallel to those of Goethe, and suggested to Goethe, as I feel compelled to think, some of the characteristic features of his Wilhelm.

He introduces an actress, Mme. Riccoboni (*l. c.*, pp. 239 sq.). She is the author of a number of works that are charming, full of genius, delicacy and grace. She shows both in her works and in her conduct that she is *sensible*, that is, emotional, and impulsive.

"A sad incident in her life came near driving her to the grave. For twenty years her tears had not ceased to flow. Well! This woman, one of the most emotional that nature has formed, has been one of the *worst actresses* who have ever appeared on the stage. *No one talks better about the art, no one plays worse.* She knows it and does not complain of the marks of disapprobation she receives from the public. And yet she has a good face, she is witty; she *carries herself becomingly*; her voice has nothing disagreeable. She possessed *all the good qualities that education can give. In society she was all that could be desired.* She is scarcely noticed, but *when she speaks, people listen with the greatest pleasure.*—And yet she failed as an actress.—*It is because she constantly remained herself that the public constantly refused to like her.*

If we bear in mind that Wilhelm's fate as an actor, indicated in the novel, would have been the same as Madame Riccoboni's if he had continued on the stage, we see that, in every essential respect, Wilhelm's character furnishes

an exact parallel to that of Diderot's Madame Riccoboni. Wilhelm was supremely emotional and impulsive; he never ceased to shed tears over that early disappointment which had brought him to the verge of the tomb; he had a fine figure, a sympathetic voice; when he talked, people listened with pleasure; he was well educated, he had engaged in literary work, he behaved with propriety and grace, *but he could play only himself.* Like Madame Riccoboni he talks well about the art, but he is not an actor. Jarno's criticism fits him, and Jarno speaks exactly like Diderot.

I pointed out in my opening remarks, that Diderot has written a thesis which he felt bound to defend. Nothing of the kind is found in Goethe. The reflections interspersed in the novel spring naturally from the situation and the character of the speakers. For this reason in order to make a comparison satisfactory, it is necessary to study the characters and the situations in Goethe quite as particularly as the remarks that bear on our subject. And, of course, it is understood that Goethe's aim was a much higher one, and that our comparison touches only a special feature of his work. On the other hand, we must admit that Goethe undoubtedly learned much from Diderot, for this writer was one of the most suggestive in the whole range of French literature; an acute observer, a close reasoner in specific lines, endowed with an immense power of mental acquisition, an excellent memory and a penetrating intellect. That Goethe undertook the translation of Diderot's *Neveu de Rameau*, the subject of which is largely music, in which Goethe was only slightly interested, proves that he appreciated the peculiar qualities of this rare mind; and the fact that he was acquainted with this composition which for many years was accounted lost, adds force to the argument that he must have been acquainted also with Diderot's other writings, and surely with one so much in line with his own observations, as the *Paradoxe sur le Comédien*.

After every allowance is made the following facts will be found to stand out very clearly:

Diderot's Garrick and Riccoboni correspond to Goethe's Serlo and Wilhelm Meister.

Diderot insists that an actor must not be emotional (while, of course, granting that he may have emotions independently of his character as an artist); that he must be a cool observer, a good imitator, possessed of penetrating intellect, and diligent in practice and repetition.

Goethe shows that Serlo is just such an actor, that every one of these conditions is fulfilled in his case, and that he possesses these very qualities in the highest degree.

Diderot states that the emotional and impulsive character is not fit for the stage, nor for any artistic calling (cf. *l.c.*, p. 220, ll. 16-20) because such a person can play and represent only himself.

Goethe makes his Jarno say almost the same, and he shows that he thinks exactly as Diderot in his treatment of the character and career of Wilhelm.

It would be interesting to trace relations between Diderot's thoughts and Goethe's in some other respects.

While Goethe seems to attribute to Diderot an excessive regard for 'naturalness' on the stage, in the remark in *Aus meinem Leben*, Book iii (Weimar Edition, p. 148), we find that Diderot, in the article which I have here considered, is very emphatic in discriminating between the *truth of art* and the *truth of nature*. What he says (*l.c.*, pp. 225 sq.) anticipates Goethe's own views, and while I do not think that Goethe borrowed these views from Diderot, I must, on the other hand, admit that Goethe was not quite just to Diderot in that remark. Diderot says:

"Réfléchissez un moment sur ce qu'on appelle au théâtre être vrai. Est-ce montrer les choses comme elles sont en nature? *Aucunement. Le vrai, en ce sens, ne serait que le commun.* Qu'est-ce donc que le vrai de la scène? C'est la conformité des actions, de la figure, de la voix, du mouvement, du geste, avec un modèle idéal imaginé par le poète, et souvent exagéré par le comédien. . . . De là vient que le comédien dans la rue ou sur la scène sont deux personnages si différents, qu'on a peine à les reconnaître" (pp. 225 sq.).

Goethe, in the remark referred to, speaks of a time when

"according to Diderot's principles and examples the most natural naturalness was demanded on the stage, and a complete illusion

was considered the proper end of theatrical art.

The passage quoted above shows, however, that Goethe and Diderot agree, for Goethe says, in different language and in regard to a different subject, essentially the same as Diderot. In *Aus meinem Leben*, Book xi, p. 76, we read:

"The highest mission of every art is to produce by appearance the illusion of a higher reality. On the other hand, it is a false endeavor to realize the appearance so long until at last *only a common reality remains.*"

Diderot had said: "The *true*, in this sense, *would be only the common.*"

In a well-known passage, Goethe defends himself against the charge of a lack of patriotism during the period of the German wars of liberation. One of his defenses is "that he could not hate the French to whom he (and the rest of his nation) owed such a large portion of their culture." That Goethe admired Diderot is apparent from the quotation in the beginning of this article; that he was, to a greater or less degree, influenced in his own thinking and writing by the French author, seems to admit of scarcely a doubt, and that this influence is particularly striking in his Wilhelm Meister, will be granted, unless I am greatly mistaken, by all who will take the trouble of verifying the statements of this paper.

C. A. EGGERT.

University of Chicago.

A SUGGESTION ON LESSING'S KEIN MENSCH MUSS MUESSEN.¹

Wie gar noch heute jemand in Lessing einen Anhänger der Willensfreiheit erblicken kann, scheint den Urkunden gegenüber mehr als paradox.²

Lessing zieht die Konsequenz aus Leibniz' System, wenn er die Willensfreiheit leugnet.³

Instead of quoting or referring to the numerous passages in Lessing's own writings which would uphold the above quotations from Schmidt and Zeller, it is sufficient to make

¹ *Nathan der Weise*, I. 385.

² Erich Schmidt, *Lessing*, Vol. II, 2nd part (that is, of vol. II), p. 626.

³ Zeller, *Lessing als Theolog*, in Von Sybel's *Historische Zeitschrift*, Vol. XXIII, pp. 343 ff. See pp. 362-363.

here the general reference to Hebler's treatment of this subject.⁴ Of course, in saying that Lessing denied the freedom of the will, no one would for a moment think of him as conceiving man as a blind and utterly helpless tool of circumstances. Hebler says:⁵

Im Zusatz zum zweiten Wolfenbüttler Fragment heisst es von der Macht unserer sinnlichen Begierden, unserer dunklen Vorstellungen über alle noch so deutliche Erkenntniss, dass 'wir es in uns haben sie zu schwächen, und wir uns ihrer eben so wohl zu guten als zu bösen Handlungen bedienen können.' Ebenso, wenn die Erziehung d. M. G., §74, sagt, 'dass der Mensch auf der ersten und niedrigsten Stufe seiner Menschheit schlechterdings so Herr seiner Handlungen nicht sei, dass er moralischen Gesetzen folgen könne,' so ist auch hierin enthalten, dass er zu dieser Herrschaft auf späteren und höheren Stufen gelange. Aber auch der Determinist, z. B. Jerusalem, spricht ja von 'Beherrschung unserer Leidenschaften durch die Vernunft.' Das ist nicht eine Freiheit zwischen oder über Nothwendigkeit und Willkür, sondern eine Freiheit, die ganz innerhalb der ersteren fällt, eine blosse Art derselben ist, nämlich diejenige Nothwendigkeit, wo das am stärksten Nöthigende die Vernunft ist.

Quite the same thing, it seems to me, is meant by Nathan in the passage:⁶

. Ich dachte mir nur immer,
Der Derwisch—so der rechte Derwisch—woll'
Aus sich nichts machen lassen.

That is, the Dervish "der unter Menschen möchte ein Mensch zu sein verlernen,"⁷ cannot make it agree with his 'Vernunft' to have anything to do with human society, no matter whether the Dervish himself recognizes this as the motive for his action or not, in Nathan's view he *must* act thus, on this account. But *our* Dervish is not quite sure he holds the general view of his class: "Dass er kein rechter sei, mag auch wohl wahr sein. Zwar wenn man muss"—and then comes the line which has given considerable difficulty to that class of commentators who have made a more or less thorough study of Lessing's works outside of *Nathan*:

. Muss! Derwisch!—Derwisch muss!
Kein Mensch muss müssen, und ein Derwisch müsste?
Was müsste' er denn?

⁴ *Lessing-Studien*, Article vi, pp. 144 ff.: *Lessing und Jerusalem, oder Lessing's Gedanken über Willensfreiheit*.

⁵ P. 159.

⁶ *Nathan*, II, 380-383.

⁷ *Nathan*, I, 498.

Hebler states and comments on the question thus:

"Eine andere Stelle, welche das Müssen zu leugnenscheint, steht im *Nathan*, und brauchte insofern nicht dem Denker, sondern nur dem Dichter, oder vielmehr nur der dramatischen Person, welcher er sie in den Mund legt, angerechnet zu werden. Aber diese Person ist der weise Jude selbst, und Worte und Gedanken sind so eigenthümlich Lessingisch, dass wir hier, ohne darum Verse mit Paragraphen zu verwechseln, auf jene Unterscheidungen Verzicht leisten wollen. Der Derwisch hat sich zu grosser Verwunderung seines Freundes zum Schatzmeister des Sultans machen lassen, machen lassen *müssen*, behauptet er.

NATHAN: *Kein Mensch muss müssen, und ein Derwisch müsste?*

Was müsste' er denn?

. Aber die Worte: Kein Mensch muss müssen!—wird hier nicht schlechthin das Müssen verneint? Nein, eben nicht; nur entweder das *Müssen* des Müssens wird verneint, oder das Müssen des *Müssens*. Im ersten Fall ist die Meinung diese: wenn der Mensch auch muss, so ist doch das Gegentheil dessen, was er muss, nicht sich selbst widersprechend, und insofern möglich; das Müssen ist kein geometrisches oder metaphysisches, sondern nur ein physisches oder psychologisches oder moralisches, und seinem besonderen Inhalt nach ein sehr verschiedenes für verschiedene Menschen und in verschiedenen Zuständen eines und desselben Menschen. Im andern Falle ist davon die Rede, dass wir, wenn wir auch wollen *müssen*, doch immerhin *wollen* müssen."

Hebler *may* be right. We *can* take the words in either sense—though the context is rather against it—and through a long series of reflections approximate them to Lessing's general well-established view. But in a drama particularly, any utterance requiring so much speculation to get at its real meaning, and then not being decisive one way or the other, is out of place; and though a large number of passages in *Nathan* contain allusions which are by no means on the surface, and have in many cases not been pointed out at all, yet they are of such a nature, that their recognition or non-recognition very little affects the play as a work of art, and they hardly warrant us in making Lessing in the person of his Nathan either so inconsistent with himself as the common superficial reading of these lines would make him appear, or so obscure as

Hebler's labored explanation and the general disagreement on the passage seem to indicate.

Less objectionable might be this explanation. There is no doubt Lessing started out to hint at his view on the freedom of the will, and he does so in the words of the Dervish: "Warum man ihn *recht*⁸ bittet, und er *für gut erkennt*: das *muss* ein Derwisch." Nathan in order to make an opportunity suitable for an expression of this view, has to utter his maxim casually, without much regard to his deeper philosophic conviction. As soon as he hears the Dervish express his own *real* view, however, he at once approves. A rather serious objection to this explanation is the fact that it presumes on the part of Nathan a thoughtlessness, which he nowhere else betrays as an ingredient of his character. To think with Düntzer and others of main force brought to bear on the Dervish, would not only do violence to the character of the Sultan as Nathan describes it,⁹ but it would also make Nathan say an absurdity in the broadness of his famous answer, because that would preclude all the established means of dealing with the refractory members of human society. There is one more interpretation, which, to my mind, is free from all these objections.

Professor Primer in his note on the Dervish, and in a private letter to the writer, well observes that the general character of the Dervish points to a freedom from all restraint, and that the battle-cry of the Dervishes was freedom. He informs me that Eduard Niemeyer in his commentary on *Nathan*,¹⁰ expresses a cognate idea. The same view I find in Hebler.¹¹ Bear this fact in mind, together with the other that Lessing—provided Nathan's views are his, and we have no reason to doubt it—could not for himself say: "Kein Mensch muss müssen," and then read the lines in connection:

NATHAN: Ich dachte mir nur immer,
Der Derwisch—so der rechte Derwisch—woll'
Aus sich nichts machen lassen.

⁸ I emphasize the *recht*, not merely because I should consider this necessary for a correct statement of Lessing's view, but also because the Dervish later on (461-476) dwells at length on the manner in which he was entreated by the Sultan.

⁹ ll. 1343-1345.

¹⁰ l. 385.

¹¹ P. 161.

DERWISCH: Beim Propheten.
Dass ich kein rechter bin, mag auch wohl wahr
sein.
Zwar wenn man muss. —

NATHAN: Muss! Derwisch!—Derwisch muss?
Kein Mensch muss müssen, und ein Derwisch
müsste?
Was müsst' er denn?

DERWISCH: Warum man ihn recht bittet,
Und er für gut erkennt: das muss ein Derwisch.

NATHAN: Bei unseren Gott! Da sagst du wahr.—Lass
dich Umarmen, Mensch.

It seems to me not at all unnatural that the line under consideration should then bear this import: "Es ist doch sonst euer Grundsatz: Kein Mensch muss müssen, und nun sagst du, ein Derwisch, der sich eben in diesem Grundsatz von so manchem andern, und besonders von mir unterscheidet, du müsstest?" In other words: the sentence: "Kein Mensch muss müssen," is not to be taken as Nathan's own words, but rather as a formulation of the principles of the Dervish as exemplified in his whole character, or, possibly, as a quotation of a favorite sentence of his which he might very well have uttered time and again in his conversations with Nathan in former days. Observe the two exclamation points, the dash and the interrogation point—all in the half-line: "Muss! Derwisch!—Derwisch muss?" Lessing does not punctuate thoughtlessly. Nathan has caught his friend in an inconsistency. He is surprised and half jokingly reminds him: We used to differ on this point, you know; you have not come over on my side? The Dervish has, at least partially, come over, has learned his own thoughts more clearly, possibly, and in the next line expresses Nathan's own view: "Warum man ihn *recht* bittet und er *für gut erkennt*: das *muss* ein Derwisch." That is Lessing: where circumstances and clear conception of the inherent goodness and rightness of a thing unite in appealing to our better judgment: in cases like that there is *no choice* for a man who has risen above the state of man in which dark passions control the clear dictates of his reason and judgment.¹² Nathan says himself that this is *his* conception of the freedom or non-freedom of the will, of "Müssen:"

¹² Cf. Lessing's *Werke* (Hempel), xv, Cap. 265.

Bei unserm Gott! Da sagst du wahr.—Lass dich
Umarmen, Mensch.

T. DIEKHOFF.

University of Michigan.

NICHOLAS BRETON AND GEORGE GASCOIGNE.

THE connection between Nicholas Breton and George Gascoigne is worthy of a fuller recognition than it has yet received. Breton was a man whose intellectual development was slow; even between the ages of thirty-five and fifty, he shows in some directions not only a remarkable widening of thought, but a very unusual increase of ease in handling his material. To such a man the years from twenty-three to thirty-two were formative years, and this is just the period during which he came most closely under the influence of Gascoigne, who had married his widowed mother. There is no reason to believe that the relation between these poets was other than harmonious, and the nine years seem to have been a time of apprenticeship for the younger. The fact that there is an interval of fifteen years between Breton's first poems, published just before Gascoigne's death, and his next work, strongly suggests that he felt his encouragement and support in authorship to have been removed.

By occasional phrase or allusion, Breton shows his familiarity with Gascoigne's poems, but it speaks well for his literary independence that even his earliest work was in no degree imitative. Indeed, there is far more resemblance between his satire of 1600 than his poems of 1577 and any of Gascoigne's productions. His originality, however, was strictly subjective, and consisted in adding something of his own to whatever established fashion he chose to follow. In delicacy of imagery, he improves greatly upon Gascoigne, who "drowns in dole," and "wallows in joy," whose sighs "boil" out of his heart and "scald" his breast in the process: for example, where Gascoigne says,

"Amid my bale I bathe in bliss,"

Breton writes far more delicately,

"They bide in bliss amid their weary bale."

In satire, both show the same penetrating

but kindly insight; the same power to outline in a few strokes the good and the bad; the same carefulness to blame wrongs rather than individuals; the same sensitive watchfulness not to wound the innocent. Breton's satire was directed chiefly against wealth *versus* poverty; Gascoigne takes higher ground and satirizes "such as love to seem but not to be;" but both write, not like recluses, but like men who knew their world. The world of nature, too, both knew and both loved, but Gascoigne had here the wider view and was by far the keener observer.

In religious poetry, Gascoigne's Calvinistic pessimism would have been as incomprehensible to Breton as the ecstasies of Southwell. At the thought of death, Southwell gazes with rapturous longing into the heaven that opens before him; Gascoigne, with his overflowing vitality, flinches and fears; Breton leisurely sentimentalizes. His hopeful, sunny nature gleams through the slight melancholy that he regards as the proper atmosphere to surround a religious poem. He often cries out of the depths, but he never loses a cheerful confidence in the result of his supplications.

In manly independence Breton is absolutely unbending. Even in those of his dedications and prefaces that are written in the euphuistic vein, so subtle an incentive to flattery, he makes no attempt to curry the favor that removed so many obstacles from the path of the literary man of the sixteenth century. Gascoigne makes appeals for patronage, distasteful as they must have been to him, and he does it in a delightfully persistent, business-like fashion, as if he meant to end a disagreeable matter as soon as possible. Breton manifests a "decent respect to the opinions of mankind" in that he usually asks that his book be read, and evinces a healthy gratitude in advance, but he does not hesitate to sign himself "Your friend as I find cause." Sometimes he does not even ask for a reading, but says, "You shall read it if it shall please you, and consider it as it shall like you."

Of the *Sweet Lullaby*, by far the best of all the poems ascribed to Breton, a word must be said. Grosart somewhat magisterially claims it for Breton, but gives no proof therefor.

Saintsbury says that such a claim "is based on little external and refuted by all internal evidence." I do not find in the poem one trace of the qualities of Breton's thought or of the usual marks of his style. I claim it for Gascoigne on the following grounds:

1. Similarity of phrase with lines in Gascoigne's *Epitaph upon Captain Bouchier*.

- a. "A noble youth of blood and bone
His glancing looks, if he once smile,
Right honest women may beguile."
Lullabie.
- a. He might for birth have boasted noble race,
Yet were his manners meek and always mild,
Who gave a guess by gazing on his face,
And judged thereby might quickly be beguiled."
Epitaph.
- b. "Although a lion in the field,
A lamb in town thou shalt him find."
Lullabie.
- b. "In field a lion and in town a child."
Epitaph.

2. The clear-eyed, unconventional view of right, a characteristic of Gascoigne, but directly opposed to the unvarying conventionality of Breton.

3. The impression given by the poem that it is the product of a moment of inspiration, and not of any poetical industry. These moments of inspiration were as characteristic of the work of Gascoigne, as is the impression of industry given by the works of Breton.

EVA MARCH TAPPAN.

University of Pennsylvania.

SOME LINGUISTIC SUGGESTIONS.

I. GERMAN *Mich*.

It is customary to compare this form with Greek $\epsilon\mu\acute{\epsilon}\ \gamma\epsilon$, $\gamma\epsilon$ being an enclitic by common interpretation. This comparison is but a half-truth: $\epsilon\mu\acute{\epsilon}\ \gamma\epsilon$ is a false analysis of $*\epsilon\text{-}\mu\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\text{-}\epsilon$. In the Sanskrit paradigm of the first person pronoun we have a nom. *ah-am*, dat. *mah-y-am*, and the Aryan character of *mah-* is vouched for by the Latin dat. *mih-i*. German *mich* is an accusative to the Aryan stem $*ma\acute{g}h-$,¹ Sk. $*mah-am$, Latin $*meh-em$, Gk. (Doric) $*\epsilon\text{-}\mu\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\text{-}\alpha$. The Attic $*\epsilon\text{-}\mu\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\text{-}\epsilon$ has the same accusative ending as the brief form $\mu\text{-}\epsilon$. There is some phonetic difficulty involved in the rep-

¹ By α I indicate α^x .

resentation of the Sk. h by Gk. γ and the doublet $g\parallel h$ in Latin (*ego* \parallel *mih-i*). This Scylla of phonetic variation may be avoided by leaping into the Charybdis of interjectional words and recognizing an Aryan interjection $g\acute{a}$ and another $gh\acute{a}$ which were somehow merged by agglutination (reprehensible glottogonic device!) with the stem $me\parallel e$ of the first person pronoun.² For myself I accept the alternative of phonetic variation, but so far am I from rejecting glottogonic methods that I believe it is the true goal, as it will be the great glory, of linguistics to penetrate into the very womb of *Vāch* (the speech-goddess of the Hindus); and so I venture to suggest the *motif* of the stem $*ma\acute{g}h-$, as I have ventured once before³ to suggest the *motif* of the Aryan word for the tongue. The first person stem $*ma\acute{g}h-$ as reconstructed is precisely identical with $*ma\acute{g}h-$, 'great,' which shows in Greek and Latin the same perverseness of a sonant g for an aspirate h . Can we mediate between "I" and "big," not to fall into the comedy of the English "big I"? I have suggested⁴ that the notion "I" developed from the grunt rendered *hem*, *hum*, *humph*, etc., by English as she is spelt, a grunt whose phonetics has but partial justice done it by the spellings $yh\parallel hm$. Astonishment is one of the prevailing notions expressed by this grunt. Why should it not be the *nar* iculate base of the articulate $ma\acute{g}h-$, 'big'?

II. ENGLISH *spray*=GERMAN *spren*, 'CHAFF.'

Neither Skeat nor Kluge in their etymological dictionaries recognize the kinship of these words. The phonetics is entirely normal, cf. *hay*=German *heu*. The semasic relation is absolutely perspicuous, as Gk. $\alpha\chi\gamma\eta$ 'spray,' 'chaff,' shows.

III. GERMAN *streu*, 'STRAW.'

The vocalization of *streu* is abnormal, and has never been explained. It was, I suggest, semasically associated at an early Germanic period with *heu*, 'hay,' and *spren*, 'chaff,'

² Cf. Brugmann, *Gr.*, ii, §434, and Lindsay, *Latin Language*, ch. x, §1.

³ MOD. LANG. NOTES, vol. ix, col. 270.

⁴ *Am. J. Phil.*, xv, 414; cf. Dabney's *Don Miff*, Ch. xxx, for further illustration. One of Dabney's spellings is *m'h'm*, and another *umgh*.

and entirely assimilated in its vocalization.

I take here a text for the question of method in linguistic investigation. Any right study of the word for etymological purposes begins, like charity, at home. It is much more important to know the usage of *streu* in German than to rush off to Gk. *στροπέννυμι* 'strew' for a comparison. We should find out for *streu* first the etymologically related words in its own language, then the words actually and conceivably associated with it by similarity and dissimilarity of usage. Then one may profitably have recourse to the sister languages, and so give *στροπέννυμι*, etc., their due. If there is any phonetic abnormality it will very likely find its clue in the words that moved in the same circle with the word in question, say, *streu*. It is of interest in passing to note that the verb systems have been patterned on *streu*, the noun.

IV. LITHUANIAN *ugñs* 'FIRE.'

In illustration of the remarks just made I pass to the word for 'fire' represented in Sk. *agñs*, Lat. *igñs*, O.Bulg. *ogñ* and Lith. *ugñs*. Arguing from Sanskrit and Old Bulgarian the Aryan was **agni-* or **ogni-*; *igñs* seems irreconcilable with **ogni-*, and most naturally demands **egni-*, but inasmuch as Latin *l̃ena* 'pander' is akin to *λαγνός* 'salacious,' we cannot be sure that **agni-* would not have given **ēgni*, whence **igni-* by an undeniable alternation between *ē* and *i* in Latin, due perhaps to palatalization.⁵ On the other hand *agnus*, 'lamb,' *magnus*, 'great,' *stagnum*, 'standing water,' may either show the normal phonetics of the group *agn*, or may have been influenced by *agere*, 'drive' (flocks), *magis*, 'more,' *stare*, 'stand.' Between these possibilities who shall decide? Very much more important than this delicate phonetic question is the Latin feeling for *igñs*. It is associated now and then with *lignum*, 'firewood';⁶ *igñs* and *ictus*, as well as *fulmen*, are not uncommonly used for 'lightning,' the two former in Vergil and Lucretius particularly; *ictus fulmen* is a standing idiom; *fulmineus igñs* and *fulmineus ictus* are also

⁵ Cf. Lindsay, *l.c.*, iv, 27.

⁶ Cf. *ligna circumdare—ignemque subicere*, Cic., *Verr.*, 2, 1. 27, 69.

phrases in current use. Further the idiom *subicere ignem*, 'to fling fire,' is as current as a term of warfare as *iacere fulmen* 'to fling a thunderbolt' is of Jupiter's prowess with that weapon; while *ictus* is probably a ptc. of *iacere*. We may be perfectly sure then that, irrespective of all Aryan belongings, *igñs* and *ictus* were congeneric to the feeling of the Romans, and were associated in their phonetics; and so *igñs* is not capable of throwing any light upon the Aryan base, though Agni's character as the lightning-god is confirmatory of the Roman use of *igñs*.

We turn, then, to the abnormality of Lith. *ugñs*. This was in primitive Balto-Slavic **agni-*. I am not well enough versed in Lithuanian to make any suggestion as to the alterant cause from my own reading, and I am without good lexical aids, but *ugñs* must have been associated with words meaning 'burn,' as in Latin, say, *igñs urit*, 'fire burns;' and as *usñs*, 'stinging-nettle' (*Brennnessel*), vouches for the preservation in Balto-Slavic of the Aryan root *us-*, 'burn,' we may plausibly lay the abnormal vocalization of *ugñs* to the charge of *usñs*, a word absolutely identical in its entire formation.

Such suggestions, however, of the esoteric associations of words within a given language belong, of course, to special students of the language. I emphasize once more the importance of knowing the idiomatic treatment of words in their individual semasic groups before the general linguist has a right to propound inviolable phonetic laws. Thus Latin *igñs* can tell us nothing of the treatment of *a* before *gn*, nor of the Latin handling of Aryan *gn*.

V. LITHUANIAN *yr̃* 'IS': *ir̃* 'AND.'

J. Schmidt, has connected *yr̃* and its byform *yr̃à* with Gk. *ὀρμενός*, 'setting out'; cf. Sk. *√ir̃*, 'put in motion.' To the same root Eng. *art* (2d. sg.) is assigned. But *art* and *are* get their *r* satisfactorily accounted for by the absolutely regular operation of Verner's law for *are*, and for *art*, by the penetration of *r* from the plural to the singular. Just so, in Old Norse, from the regular plural *erum*, *eruð*, *eru* has come a sg. *er*, *ert*, *er*, beside the older *em*, *est*, *es*, while in the Gothic preterit the *s*,

of the singular *was*, etc., has routed the *z* of the plural **wēzum*, etc. Who can doubt that when the primitive Germanic paradigm was in course of change a 2d sg. **es-i* was likely to suffer rhotacism along with the 1st plur. *esum*, etc.? The primitive 2d sg. then became *er*, and to this the ending *t* was added from *was-t* and the preterit presents. From **ert* came by normal change *ear*⁷ whose vocalization shifted the 1st sg. to *eam*⁸ beside *eóm* and the 3d plur. to *earon*. Such is the simplest, and a quite satisfactory explanation, and accords with that of the *Century Dictionary*.⁸

Brugmann, however, in the *Grundriss*, maintains and expands the tenet of J. Schmidt. But we have seen that no phonetic conditions demand the separation of *art* and *are* from *am* and *is*. The only warrant for such a separation outside of Anglo-Saxon is found in the Lithuanian forms *yrà* || *ýr*. I think I can offer a simpler explanation for these forms, viz; to divide *ý-ra* || *y-r*. Here the *r*-form is to be connected with the *r* of the Latin and Celtic deponent-passive, and the *y* of the Sanskrit perfects.⁹ How then is the *ý* to be explained? It may be an alternative to an Aryan *ē*.¹⁰ I have suggested¹¹ that the copulative verb was originally a demonstrative *ē*-subsequently developed into a verb root *e-s*, and I explained the copulative participle represented by Latin *et* as an abandoned 3d sg. of the copulative verb. With this suggestion Lith. *ýr*, 'he is,' beside *ir*, 'and,' seems also to coincide.

This may seem a purely glottogonic speculation, but I have brought forward in the place cited some examples to prove that in Greek there was a root *e*- besides *es*, 'be' (<'there.!') Who will may prefer to compare Sk. *√ir*, 'set in motion,' and *ōprvut*, same meaning. Apollonius Rhodius does, to be sure, use *ōpōpa* in a sense nearly like *ēsti*, 'he is.' But this

⁷ For the relation of *eam* to *am*, I refer to Sweet's *Hist. of Eng. Sounds*, §442.

⁸ Cf. also V. Henry, *Gram. Comp. de l'Anglaise*, etc., p. 362.

⁹ Cf. Brugmann, *Gr.*, ii, §1076 sq., and the author, *Am. J. Phil.*, xv, 432.

¹⁰ Cf. the author, *l.c.*, xvi, 5 sq., and v. Rozwadowski, *B.B.*, xxi, 154 sq.

¹¹ *l.c.* p. 19.

archaist cannot be trusted to represent a genuine usage. The student of Homer knows how prolific he is in quasi-copulative verbs, and it happens that *πέλω*, 'rise up' and 'be,' could easily have wrought a later *ὀρωρα*, 'he is,' beside *ὀρσοε*, 'rise!' Homer himself, it must be admitted, seems to fore-shadow this, but after all it is dangerous to infer from the highly developed transfers of meaning in an artificial language like that of the Greek epic, where so many words reach a quasi-copulative force, to the common everyday copula of Lithuanian.

EDWIN W. FAY.

Washington and Lee University.

THE STRESS OF GERMAN AND ENGLISH COMPOUND GEOGRAPHICAL NAMES.

It is at times convenient to divide the various forces that determine the stress of words into two classes: psychological and physical. By the latter are meant the oral elements of a word and their relations to one another and to the elements of neighboring words. For example: (1) it is difficult to sound a heavy syllable without stressing it, hence such a word as *lē''ben'dig* is apt to become *leben'dig* unless psychological forces prevent, so Middle-English *el''lev'ne* > *elev'ne* 'eleven'; (2) after a strong stress the organs require some time in which to recover, whereby an alternate rhythm is favored, cf. *Welt''aus''stel'lung* > *Welt''ausstel'lung*, *Win''ches''ter* > *Win''ches-ter*; (3) a stress is apt to be weakened because of the necessity of stressing a succeeding word, while on the other hand force is freely spent on a stress near the end,—whence the frequent vacillation in stress according as a word is attributive or predicate: often *stock'dumm''* but *ein stock'dum'mer Mensch''*, *Portion'* but *eine Por'tion Kaf'fee*, *well-bred'* but a *well-bred per'son*.

The more familiar a word and the oftener used by an individual or a community, the more it becomes subject to the physical forces. The normal stress of such a word as *Herzog* is *Her''zog'*, and in distinction from it *Erzherzog* and *Grossherzog* are generally stressed *Erz''her''zog'* and *Gross''her''zog'*, though

and entirely assimilated in its vocalization.

I take here a text for the question of method in linguistic investigation. Any right study of the word for etymological purposes begins, like charity, at home. It is much more important to know the usage of *streu* in German than to rush off to Gk. *στροπερρῶμι* 'strew' for a comparison. We should find out for *streu* first the etymologically related words in its own language, then the words actually and conceivably associated with it by similarity and dissimilarity of usage. Then one may profitably have recourse to the sister languages, and so give *στροπερρῶμι*, etc., their due. If there is any phonetic abnormality it will very likely find its clue in the words that moved in the same circle with the word in question, say, *streu*. It is of interest in passing to note that the verb systems have been patterned on *streu*, the noun.

IV. LITHUANIAN *ugñs* 'FIRE.'

In illustration of the remarks just made I pass to the word for 'fire' represented in Sk. *agnis*, Lat. *ignis*, O.Bulg. *ogñ* and Lith. *ugñs*. Arguing from Sanskrit and Old Bulgarian the Aryan was **agni-* or **ogni-*; *ignis* seems irreconcilable with **ogni-*, and most naturally demands **egni-*, but inasmuch as Latin *lēna* 'pander' is akin to *λαγνός* 'salacious,' we cannot be sure that **agni-* would not have given **igni-*, whence **igni-* by an undeniable alternation between *ē* and *ī* in Latin, due perhaps to palatalization.⁵ On the other hand *agnus*, 'lamb,' *magnus*, 'great,' *stagnum*, 'standing water,' may either show the normal phonetics of the group *agn-*, or may have been influenced by *agere*, 'drive' (flocks), *magis*, 'more,' *stare*, 'stand.' Between these possibilities who shall decide? Very much more important than this delicate phonetic question is the Latin feeling for *ignis*. It is associated now and then with *lignum*, 'firewood';⁶ *ignis* and *ictus*, as well as *fulmen*, are not uncommonly used for 'lightning,' the two former in Vergil and Lucretius particularly; *ictus fulmen* is a standing idiom; *fulmineus ignis* and *fulmineus ictus* are also

⁵ Cf. Lindsay, *l.c.*, iv, §7.

⁶ Cf. *ligna circumdare—ignemque subicere*, Cic., *Verr.*, 2, 1, 27, 69.

phrases in current use. Further the idiom *subicere ignem*, 'to fling fire,' is as current as a term of warfare as *iacere fulmen* 'to fling a thunderbolt' is of Jupiter's prowess with that weapon; while *ictus* is probably a ptc. of *iacere*. We may be perfectly sure then that, irrespective of all Aryan belongings, *ignis* and *ictus* were congeneric to the feeling of the Romans, and were associated in their phonetics; and so *ignis* is not capable of throwing any light upon the Aryan base, though Agni's character as the lightning-god is confirmatory of the Roman use of *ignis*.

We turn, then, to the abnormality of Lith. *ugñs*. This was in primitive Balto-Slavic **agni-*. I am not well enough versed in Lithuanian to make any suggestion as to the alterant cause from my own reading, and I am without good lexical aids, but *ugñs* must have been associated with words meaning 'burn,' as in Latin, say, *ignis urit*, 'fire burns,' and as *usñs*, 'stinging-nettle' (Brennnessel), vouches for the preservation in Balto-Slavic of the Aryan root *us-*, 'burn,' we may plausibly lay the abnormal vocalization of *ugñs* to the charge of *usñs*, a word absolutely identical in its entire formation.

Such suggestions, however, of the esoteric associations of words within a given language belong, of course, to special students of the language. I emphasize once more the importance of knowing the idiomatic treatment of words in their individual semasiac groups before the general linguist has a right to propound inviolable phonetic laws. Thus Latin *ignis* can tell us nothing of the treatment of *a* before *gn*, nor of the Latin handling of Aryan *gn*.

V. LITHUANIAN *yr* 'IS': *ir* 'AND.'

J. Schmidt, has connected *yr* and its byform *yr̃a* with Gk. *ὀρμενός*, 'setting out'; cf. Sk. *√ir*, 'put in motion.' To the same root Eng. *art* (2d. sg.) is assigned. But *art* and *are* get their *r* satisfactorily accounted for by the absolutely regular operation of Verner's law for *are*, and for *art*, by the penetration of *r* from the plural to the singular. Just so, in Old Norse, from the regular plural *erum*, *eruð*, *eru* has come a sg. *er*, *er̃*, *er*, beside the older *em*, *est*, *es*, while in the Gothic preterit the *s*,

of the singular *was*, etc., has routed the *z* of the plural **wēzum*, etc. Who can doubt that when the primitive Germanic paradigm was in course of change a 2d sg. **es-i* was likely to suffer rhotacism along with the 1st plur. *esum*, etc.? The primitive 2d sg. then became *er*, and to this the ending *t* was added from *was-t* and the preterit presents. From **ert* came by normal change *eart* whose vocalization shifted the 1st sg. to *eam* beside *eōm* and the 3d plur. to *earon*. Such is the simplest, and a quite satisfactory explanation, and accords with that of the *Century Dictionary*.⁸

Brugmann, however, in the *Grundriss*, maintains and expands the tenet of J. Schmidt. But we have seen that no phonetic conditions demand the separation of *art* and *are* from *am* and *is*. The only warrant for such a separation outside of Anglo-Saxon is found in the Lithuanian forms *yra* || *yr*. I think I can offer a simpler explanation for these forms, viz; to divide *y-ra* || *y-r*. Here the *r*-form is to be connected with the *r* of the Latin and Celtic deponent-passive, and the *r* of the Sanskrit perfects.⁹ How then is the *y* to be explained? It may be an alternative to an Aryan *ē*.¹⁰ I have suggested¹¹ that the copulative verb was originally a demonstrative *ē*-subsequently developed into a verb root *e-s-*, and I explained the copulative participle represented by Latin *et* as an abandoned 3d sg. of the copulative verb. With this suggestion Lith. *yr*, 'he is,' beside *ir*, 'and,' seems also to coincide.

This may seem a purely glottogonic speculation, but I have brought forward in the place cited some examples to prove that in Greek there was a root *e-* besides *es-*, 'be' (<'there.'!) Who will may prefer to compare Sk. *yir*, 'set in motion,' and *ōprvut*, same meaning. Apollonius Rhodius does, to be sure, use *ōpōpa* in a sense nearly like *ēōti*, 'he is.' But this

⁷ For the relation of *eam* to *am*, I refer to Sweet's *Hist. of Eng. Sounds*, §442.

⁸ Cf. also V. Henry, *Gram. Comp. de l'Anglaise*, etc., p. 362.

⁹ Cf. Brugmann, *Gr.*, ii, §1076 sq., and the author, *Am. J. Phil.*, xv, 432.

¹⁰ Cf. the author, *I. e.*, xvi, 5 sq., and v. Rozwadowski, *B. B.*, xxi, 134 sq.

¹¹ *I. e.* p. 19.

archaist cannot be trusted to represent a genuine usage. The student of Homer knows how prolific he is in quasi-copulative verbs, and it happens that *πέλω*, 'rise up' and 'be,' could easily have wrought a later *ὀρωρα*, 'he is,' beside *ὀροε*, 'rise!' Homer himself, it must be admitted, seems to fore-shadow this, but after all it is dangerous to infer from the highly developed transfers of meaning in an artificial language like that of the Greek epic, where so many words reach a quasi-copulative force, to the common everyday copula of Lithuanian.

EDWIN W. FAY.

Washington and Lee University.

THE STRESS OF GERMAN AND ENGLISH COMPOUND GEOGRAPHICAL NAMES.

It is at times convenient to divide the various forces that determine the stress of words into two classes: psychological and physical. By the latter are meant the oral elements of a word and their relations to one another and to the elements of neighboring words. For example: (1) it is difficult to sound a heavy syllable without stressing it, hence such a word as *lē''ben'dig* is apt to become *leben'dig* unless psychological forces prevent, so Middle-English *el''lev'ne* > *eleu'ne* 'eleven'; (2) after a strong stress the organs require some time in which to recover, whereby an alternate rhythm is favored, cf. *Welt''aus'stel'lung* > *Welt''ausstel'lung*, *Win''ches'ter* > *Win''ches-ter*; (3) a stress is apt to be weakened because of the necessity of stressing a succeeding word, while on the other hand force is freely spent on a stress near the end,—whence the frequent vacillation in stress according as a word is attributive or predicate: often *stock'dumm''* but *ein stock'dum'mer Mensch''*, *Portion'* but *eine Por'tion Kaf'fee*, *well-bred'* but a *well'-bred per'son*.

The more familiar a word and the oftener used by an individual or a community, the more it becomes subject to the physical forces. The normal stress of such a word as *Herzog* is *Her''zog'*, and in distinction from it *Erz-herzog* and *Grossherzog* are generally stressed *Erz''her''zog'* and *Gross''her''zog'*, though

this juxtaposition of three stresses gradually declining in strength is peculiarly difficult. The Thuringians constantly have occasion to speak of the *Grossherzog* of Sachsen-Weimar and have yielded in part to the physical forces, or "rhythm;" that is, while retaining the heaviest stress on *Gross*-, thus distinguishing the *Grossherzog* from the various Thuringian *Herzöge*, they shift the secondary stress to the last syllable: *Gross''herzog'*. It will be observed that this is not the best solution of the difficulty from the physical point of view, as it makes it necessary to sound the heavy medial syllable with little stress. Before a heavy final syllable we should expect a heavy medial syllable to get more stress than an equally heavy initial syllable, and this is what happens in *Grossher'zog* and *Erzher'zog* in Mecklenburg and Austria, where the same reason exists for constantly using these titles that exists in Thuringia, but less reason for distinguishing them from *Herzog*.

While a shift of the secondary stress from the second to a following syllable is common enough in German: *Vor''urteil'*, *Geld''anweisung*, *un''anstän'dig*, etc.;² the shift of the chief stress from the first member to the second is rare in ordinary German substantives because of the psychological importance of the first member. Still it does yield at times if the first member has a vague or only intensive force, especially in words made up of more than two stems: *Karfrei'tag* (but *Kar'woche*, which has only two heavy syllables), *Allge'genwart*, *Oberpost'direktion*, *Urahn'herr*, etc.; in this way *un-* has lost its stress in some German and in all English words. The tendency to shift the chief stress to a following member is much more pronounced in English than in German: thus, at least in the northern States west of the coast, one usually hears *ice-cream'*, *applepie'*, often *horserad'ish*, and, at the end of a clause, often even *high school'*, *coal stove'*, etc. In Germany the North Germans are most inclined to the shift, and among them one not only frequently hears *Käsebut'terbrot* but quite generally *Bürgermei'ster*, at Bremen *Ratskel'ler*, and at Rostock

² Cf. *Roch'ester'*, *Barn'stable'*, *New'burg'* or *New'b'ry* in Newburyport, Mass., *West'moreland'* in England, but *Westmore'land* in America.

and other places *Marienkirch'*, *Petrikirch'*, etc.

It will be observed that the last four cases, as well as some of those above, border on proper names. In fact, proper names, and geographical proper names in particular, furnish the best material for the observation of the vacillation of stress according as mental associations are vigorous or are weaker than the physical conditions. It is my purpose to illustrate this in the case of German and English compound geographical names. It will not be out of place to consider also a few names that are not compounds but, like these, have two syllables capable of heavy stress; and some matters other than stress naturally demand consideration in connection with it.

It is not practicable, in the case of such words, to observe the distinction between compounds proper and conglomerates; most of the words in question are conglomerates. Some of them; for example, *Siebenbü'r'gen*, *Wenigenje'na*, *Königsbrun'nen*, etc., *Long Is'land*, *West Virgin'ia*, *New York'*, etc.—probably have sentence-stress retained in conglomerates. But many such conglomerates came to have the stress of real compounds; for example, *Al'tenburg*, *Ho'henstein*, etc., *While'water*, *Pitts'burg*, *New'port*, etc.; and then some shifted the stress as below.

I. In a compound geographical name, the meaning of the elements, or the application of the meaning, is generally not obvious. One or both of the elements may be foreign and not understood. If the form is familiar, its application may be fanciful or no longer appropriate, and even if it is appropriate, this may be evident only to a person on the spot and perhaps there only at certain seasons. It thus comes about that a geographical name is remembered as a whole and is therefore particularly susceptible to the influence of rhythm, or physical conditions. That is, unless there is some reason for emphasizing the first member, the chief stress may be expected to shift to the second member. Shifting is most common in German in compounds in *-born-brunn-brück(en)-brunn(en)-förde-fürth-grätz-hausen-münde-reuth-roda-rode-walde-weiler-werder-werth-wörth-zell(e)*: *Waltershan'sen*, *Königsbrun'nen*, *Saar-Zweibrück'en*, *Ek-*

*ernför'de, Baireuth', Lichtenwal'de, Donau-wörth', Marienwer'der, Swinemün'de, Appenzell', Friedrichro'da.*³

In English the second member usually has the chief stress if it is *city, island, rapids, springs, creek, run, harbor, haven, etc.*:⁴ *Bay Cit'y, Rhode Is'land, Cedar Rap'ids, Saratoga Springs', Benton Har'bor, New Ha'ven.*⁵

But, as stated above, the stress of words may be determined not only by their elements but also by the relation of these to the elements of neighboring words. Thus we usually say *Ho'henlo'he* and *auf dem Ho'henzol'lern*, but *Fürst' Ho'henlo'he* and sometimes *Burg' Ho'henzol'lern*, the stress on the title being weaker than that on the name, while the stress on the intermediate heavy member *Hohen-* is strengthened and the alternate rhythm established. Similarly *die Küs'te von Nord' A'frika* but *die nord'afrika'nische Küs'te*; *O'sterwal'de*, but (in speaking of the same place) *O'sterwald' bei El'ze*, the stress on *-wald* being weakened before *Elze*, and that on *Oster-* strengthened. *Ann Ar'bor* but usually the *Ann Arbor high'school, Battle Creek'* but *Bat'tle Creek, Mich'igan*. In Tennessee the frequent use of the word as an attributive has made the pronunciation *Ten'nessee'* general.

II. In relation to a given geographical name, people are necessarily divided into two groups of nearly equal importance; first those living at or near the place, second those living some distance from it and usually constituting the larger part of the population of the country. If diversity of usage arises between these two classes (see below), it may continue, or one usage may more or less completely prevail over the other. In the case of a large city, whose name is in the mouths of people in all parts of the country, any local tendency to shift is usually overwhelmed by the general usage, thus even natives of the place say *Hei'delberg'* only occasionally. On the other hand, if the local class extends over a large

³ Cf. also *Bremerha'ven, Gastein', Hornigrin'de, Kaisers-lau'tern, Kötchenbro'da, Mariaspring', Königskron'* (palace in Charlottenburg).

⁴ Rarely if *town, burg, bury, boro, ville, port, ford, mouth, water, land, field*.

⁵ Cf. also *Three Riv'ers, Bowling Green', South Bend' Pike's Peak', Iron Moun'tain, Forest Glen', Bryn Mawr'.*

area, for example, a province or the nation itself, its usage will generally prevail: *Ost'-preussen* and *West'-preussen*. The local usage will ordinarily prevail also in the case of a small place, which is seldom mentioned except by people who live in or near it or who have visited there and have thus come under the influence of the local usage; for examples, see below.

The development of diversity of usage near and away from a place may be illustrated by a concrete case. A man living at *Osnabrück* or in its neighborhood, hears this name oftener than all other names of towns ending in *-brück*; hence the word is there readily understood even when the chief stress has been removed from the first member to the last, and it will rarely be necessary to bring the stress back to the first member. But distant places having the same ending are distinguished by being stressed on the first member; and this is just the way the people distant from *Osnabrück* treat that name. That is, in general, a place-name ending in a word that is a common ending in such names, is likely to be stressed on the second member in and about the place, and on the first member away from there. This is particularly true of small towns and cities (cf. above): most Germans would say *Bück'eburg, R'adeberg, Il'senburg, Lan'gebrück, I'serlohn, Lang'enu, Blau'teu-ren, Bern'burg, El'berfeld, Maul'bronn, Heil'-bronn, Pa'derborn, Ol'desloe, Gros'senhain, Stei'nenberg* (hill near *Tübingen*), etc.; but the inhabitants and their neighbors, as well as other persons who have come under the influence of their usage, say *Bücke'burg, Rade-berg', Maulbronn', Oldesloe', etc.*; *Spring Lake', Forest Grove', Yates Cit'y, Cripple Creek', Labrador', Syracuse', Meriden', Ches-sening', New Orleans', Newfoundland', etc.*, though people at a distance say *Crip'ple Creek, Lab'rador, New Or'leans, Newfound'-land* (in the States) or *New'foundland'* (in England).

III. On the other hand, if the names of a number of places in the same neighborhood end alike, it will generally (see, however, below) be necessary to stress the first member in order to make sure which of several possible places is meant; thus the need of distinguish-

ing the adjoining states *East Saxony*, *West Saxony* and *South Saxony*, led to the placing of a heavy stress on the first member and the eventual slurring of the second: *Es'sex*, *Sus'sex*; for the same reason the many Thuringian names in *-leben* are even there generally stressed on the first member, and the natives of *Stralsund* stress the name of their city on the first syllable to distinguish the word from the names of the various sounds on the Baltic. But as the name *Stralsund* alone is generally known in Germany, it is stressed on the second syllable by most Germans. So, too, *Greifswald* is stressed *Greifswald* at home in distinction from the names of local words, but as there are comparatively few names of large towns with the ending *-wald*, the name is generally stressed *Greifswald* in other parts of Germany. Similarly *Baden Baden* (that is, the city *Baden* in the state *Baden*) is by Baden people stressed *Ba'den Baden* in distinction from other places in the state *Baden*; other people, in whose minds the state *Baden* is not a constant psychological subject, think of *Baden Baden* as one name and often allow the chief stress to shift to the second member: *Baden Ba'den*.

But even in the same neighborhood place-names that have the same ending may receive the chief stress on the second member. This is generally true of names whose second member contains more than one syllable, the first of which is long,⁶ and whose first member contains more than one syllable, so that its stressed syllable is separated from the stressed syllable of the second member by at least one weaker syllable. In these cases the physical tendency to shift the stress is particularly strong, and the secondary stress on the first member is heavy enough to make that member distinct. Similarly, such names as *Je'na* and *Wenigenje'na*, *Sag'inaw* and *East Sag'inaw* are in themselves so different that there is no need of stressing them differently unless a distinct contrast is in mind.

Moreover, people of the locality often find it necessary to distinguish between such names as *O'berloquitz* and *Un'terloquitz*, *Gross'heringen* and *Klein'heringen*, and the like, as

⁶ For example, *förde*, *-hausen*, *-roda*, *-walde*, *-weiler*, *-werder*.

between *Alt'stadt* and *Neu'stadt*, *Ost'preussen* and *West'preussen*, *Nord'deutschland* and *Süd'deutschland*. But at a distance from one of these localities, the first member is less distinctive than the second, for there are many places beginning with *Ober-*, *Unter-*, *Nieder-*, *Gross-*, *Ost-*, *Nord-*, etc. Moreover, while the names of the pair are known and used locally, often only one of the two is known in the country at large (this is true, for example, of *Oberammergau* and *Unterammergau* and of the many words in *Hohen-*, the little town below the castle being comparatively insignificant). Hence distinctness as well as rhythm demand that the stress be placed on the second member. Unless a contrast is intended, we usually hear: *Gross-britan'nien*, *Kleina'sien*, *Nordame'rika*, *Ostin'dien*, *Ostfries'land*, *Oberam'mergau*, *Neubran'denburg*, *Hohenlo'he -twiel'*, etc. (but *Ho'henstein*, for *Hohenstein'* would suggest *hohen Stein*), *Altbrei''sach*, *Altgrie'chenland*; *Great Brit'ain*, *South Amer'ica*, *East In'dia*, *North-amp'ton*, *New Eng'land*, *Old Mis'sion*, *Nova Sco'tia*, *Lower Can'ada*, etc.

The local usage of *Un'terwalden*, *Nie'derwald*, *die Nie'derlande*, *Nord'deutschland*, *O'berdeutschland*, *Ost'- and West'preussen*; *the Neth'erlands*, *the High'lands*, *Nor'folk* and *Suff'olk*, *West'' Bay Cit'y*, and a few more. Similarly, *Ostgoten*, *Ostfranken*, *Rheinfranken*, etc., generally have the chief stress on the first member; for when that member is expressed there is usually a contrast in mind.

When a person learns that the local pronunciation is different, in stress or in the value of the letters, from what he has been accustomed to, he may despise it as dialectic, as some North Germans do in the case of *Wiesbaden* with *ie=ɪ* and of *Dresden* with the stressed *e* open as well as long, and as some Americans do in the case of names like *Alabama* with the stressed *a* as in *am* and of *Battle Creek* with *ee=ɪ*. A few years ago the railway sign *Sessenheim* was changed to *Sesenheim*, to conform to the spelling established in Goethe literature. Such names as *Troisdorf* and *Duisburg* are so often pronounced with a diphthong by railway guards, etc., that this pronunciation may prevail. Prof. Boic-horst has quite given up calling himself *Böck-*

horst. But the local pronunciation, once learned, is apt to be insisted upon as the only 'correct' one. This tendency is manifest in some books on pronunciation and on geography. It is, perhaps, proper enough to teach the local usage in those cases in which the current spelling does not properly represent the pronunciation, and people who see the word oftener than they hear it are left without guidance or are misled. This is the case in such names as *Mecklenburg*, *Schwedt*, *Börsdorf*, *Uelzen* with long *ü*, *Itzehoe* with *oe=ö*, *Duisburg* with *ui=long ü*, *Ypern* with *y=a*, *Zuidersee* with *Z=z* and *ui=o*, *Calw* with *w=p*, *Chur* with *Ch=k*, etc.; *Guilford* with *ui=l*, *Arkansas* and *Mackinac* to rime with *saw* and having the chief stress on the first syllable, *Chicago* with *Ch=sh* and *a* as in *all*, *Greenwich* with *ee=i* or *è*, *w* silent, and *ch=j* in *joy*, *Carrollton, Mich.*, with *a* as in *car* and *ro* silent, *Marlboro, Mass.*, with the first *r* and the first *o* silent and *a* usually as in *all*, *Leicester* with *ie* silent, *Glasgow* with *s=z*, *Southwark* identical with 'southern' but for final *k* and *n*. Most of these diversities would disappear if the orthography were better, and we have not given up faith in ultimate improvement in this matter. But where the diversity of usage is due to the nature of things, that is, the fact that the local population maintains toward the word a different attitude from that maintained by the outside world, it will in most cases be found to be a vain as well as needless task to attempt to establish uniformity. This applies chiefly to the matter of stress as illustrated above. When one learns that a very large number of German compound geographical names are locally stressed on the last syllable, but elsewhere almost universally on the first, he will perceive that it is rather small business to search out a few of them—like *Radeberg*, *Bernburg*, *Grossenhain*, or *Iserlohn*—and find much satisfaction in acquiring that accentuation.

GEORGE HEMPL.

University of Michigan.

EMILIA GALOTTI.

Emilia Galotti, Tragödie von G. E. Lessing.
With Introduction and Notes by O. B. SUPER,

Ph. D. New York: Henry Holt & Co. 1894.

Emilia Galotti, Ein Trauerspiel in fünf Aufzügen von Gotthold Ephraim Lessing. With Introduction and Explanatory Notes by MAX POLL, Ph. D. Boston: Ginn & Co. 1895.

Lessing's Emilia Galotti, Edited with an Introduction and Notes by MAX WINKLER, Ph. D. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co. 1895.

Two years ago Professor Super published an edition of *Emilia Galotti*, a reprint of an earlier edition, but with the notes rewritten and an introduction added. The latter is merely a short sketch of the author's career and works, with the plot of the tragedy abridged from Sime's *Life of Lessing*, and the notes are simply translations of words and phrases. As an evident misprint may be noted *von dem Allem*, p. 23, repeated on p. 71; and in the outline of the plot the statement that the prince, after his first interview with Marinelli, "goes at once" to Dosalo is not accurate. The edition is really of value simply as a convenient text and does not pretend to any critical merit.

Of entirely different character are two subsequent editions of the same drama, the one by Dr. Max Poll of Harvard, and the other by Professor Winkler of the University of Michigan. Both editions reprint the text of the Lachmann-Muncker edition, Stuttgart, 1886, but with modernized spelling and punctuation. Both have a bibliography, a scholarly introduction and valuable critical and explanatory notes, and as the respective editors have worked from different stand-points, both editions demand careful consideration from every thoughtful teacher and student of the drama.

Dr. Poll's Introduction deals with the composition and sources of the play, giving, with some completeness, the results of Roethe's article in the *Vierteljahrschrift*, in which he compares Lessing's work with Crisp's *Virginia*.¹ The editor then defends Lessing against the charge of having violated his own critical maxims, and takes up the questions of Emilia's real sentiment toward the prince, of

¹ Professor Winkler probably did not notice this important article in time for his Introduction, for he only alludes to it in a brief note added at the end.

her tragic guilt and of the inevitable necessity of the catastrophe. In these three points he essentially accepts the conclusions of Kuno Fischer in his *Lessing als Reformator der deutschen Literatur*; that is to say, he finds no evidence that Emilia secretly loved the prince, he regards her compliance with her mother's wish in neglecting to inform Appiani of the scene in the church as her tragic guilt, and considers the catastrophe as, at the moment, the only possible issue. The notes show wide and careful reading and, with occasional translations, explain difficulties of language or thought. The book is a thoroughly good piece of work.

Professor Winkler's stand-point differs radically from that of the edition just discussed. He believes that Emilia was attracted by the prince's personality, and that her moral will was paralyzed in his presence, thus making the tragic conflict her inability to obey the promptings of honor and of duty. So far he essentially agrees with Erich Schmidt, but not so concerning the catastrophe. Odoardo's act he considers as the natural result of the unbalanced idealism of his disposition and therefore as inevitable. The characterization is a well-matured and thoughtful production. Professor Winkler also specially emphasizes the influence of Diderot in determining Lessing to make his drama a "tragédie bourgeoise," instead of following Livy's story more closely. The notes are largely critical, dealing in many cases with the dramatic development, and are therefore especially interesting. The book merits high rank in the excellent series to which it belongs.

LEWIS A. RHOADES.

Cornell University.

NEW TEXT-BOOKS IN RHETORIC.

The Principles of Rhetoric. By Adams Sherman Hill. New edition, revised and enlarged. Harper & Brothers, New York: 1895, pp. x, 431.

A Handbook of English Composition. By James Morgan Hart. Eldredge & Brothers, Philadelphia: 1895, pp. xii, 360.

It is probable that no two teachers of English Composition, certainly among those who have

taught long enough to pass through the stage of imitation, follow precisely the same method of instruction. This wholesome variety of method naturally leads to one result that is not altogether desirable,—the multiplication of text-books. So many instructors in English Composition have apparently felt the lack of a suitable manual, and have undertaken to supply that lack, that there are now text-books in abundance, suited to students of every age, and representing many methods of instruction.

The books named above are the rightful successors of books that have been so long in the field that they have outlived many inferior works, now forgotten. Each book is the fruitage of the writer's wide experience as a teacher of Rhetoric. *The Principles of Rhetoric*, by Professor Adams S. Hill, appeared in 1878; after seventeen years of use in the class room it re-appears, "newly revised and enlarged to almost as much again as it was." Professor Hart's *Handbook of English Composition*, though a new work, is written to take the place of a book by the father of the author,—a book which has been widely used for nearly twenty-five years, and which many teachers of to-day remember as the guide by whose aid they were initiated into the mysteries of English Composition. The fact that there was an earlier book, though it is nowhere mentioned, perhaps accounts for the presence in the later book of certain features which are not commonly found in handbooks of English Composition.

When the first edition of *The Principles of Rhetoric* appeared (in 1878), the treatises of Campbell and Whately were still in general use in American colleges: and there need be no hesitation in saying that for class-room use, Professor Hill's book was clearly an advance upon anything that had hitherto been published in English. It was eminently a practical rhetoric,—a title that has since been claimed for more than one text-book. For seventeen years *The Principles of Rhetoric* has been tested in the class room; and, admirable though it is, the book has been found deficient in certain directions. The best evidence of this inadequacy is the use of supplementary books; for example, on Exposition, Argumen-

tation, and Theme-Writing, that have been prepared by members of the school of younger rhetoricians, trained in Professor Hill's department.

Professor Hill's revision of his book has been very complete, including structure as well as detail. Sentences have been remodeled or subjected to slight modifications, examples have been transferred to rubrics under which they fall more appropriately, fresh examples have been introduced, a more logical order of presentation has in some instances been secured. Only a close reading will detect all the minute changes that have been made. Indeed, a careful comparison of the two forms of the book, and an attempt to discover the reason that prompted every change and addition in the revised form would be an admirable training for a class of advanced students, especially for such as intend to become teachers of rhetoric. The principal divisions of the book are as follows:—Good Use; Violations of Good Use; Choice of Words; Number of Words; Arrangement of Words; Description; Narration; Exposition; Argument. The three tests of rhetorical excellence,—clearness, force, and ease,—have been raised into greater prominence; they are now applied not only to the choice of words, but also, in separate sections, to the number and arrangement of words, incidentally to paragraphs and whole compositions, and, wherever applicable, to exposition and argument. During the discussion of sentences a fourth test is added; namely, unity: and thenceforward it is regarded as of paramount importance. A welcome addition is the chapter on Exposition. Of late there has been a tendency, perhaps unduly emphasized, to look upon college students as future writers of novels and short stories; as a matter of fact, for one college graduate who does imaginative work in literature at least ten have occasion to do expository or argumentative writing. The treatment of argumentation has been entirely remodeled, and has been strengthened with new illustrative passages. The omission of the appendix on punctuation, perhaps the best brief treatment of the subject, is unfortunate; occasional reference to a treatise of this kind is profitable, even for college stud-

ents.

In the forefront of Professor Hart's book (immediately following an introductory chapter of less than two pages) are three chapters on the paragraph. When it is remembered that the earlier Hart's *Rhetoric* had no treatment of the paragraph, and that the earlier edition of Professor Hill's book gave to the subject only one page, such a procedure can be called little less than revolutionary. Few who have been out of college for as many as ten years have ever received any specific instruction in paragraph-writing; now we have not only, as might be expected and desired, dissertations on the paragraph, but we have also text-books devoted solely to the paragraph, and, in accordance with what some regard as a tendency to excessive sub-division, we have, in some universities, courses in English Composition given up entirely to the theory and practice of paragraph-writing.

Following this tendency, or, perhaps, leading it, Professor Hart introduces the student of English Composition by the gate-way of paragraph-writing. His reasons for this procedure he states succinctly and forcibly. Within the limits of the paragraph are to be found well-nigh all the difficulties that confront both teacher and pupil. Diction, sentence structure, unity, sequence, continuity, nearly all that is included in the comprehensive trio of rhetorical virtues,—clearness, force and propriety,—in, fact, all the essentials of good writing, except the structure of larger compositions, "can be learned through the paragraph."

"Every paragraph gives an opportunity for correcting what may be called the writer's *chronic* faults. . . . Although a composition may contain three or four times as many errors, in the aggregate, as a short paragraph, it will not contain more *kinds* of error than a short paragraph by the same writer."

It may be added that the frequent preparation of short papers is advantageous, for both teacher and pupils. While two or three weeks may be needed to correct and return a batch of essays of ordinary length, a day or two may suffice for the correction of a set of papers in which the writers are limited to a single page. This consideration deserves attention, especially in earlier work, in which it is desirable

that papers be promptly returned in order that they may be followed by fresh papers. Another advantage, in addition to that of prompt criticism, is the fact that students are trained from the outset to practice compression instead of that dilution of thought to which they are only too prone.

The neglect of the paragraph by writers on rhetoric is curious and almost unaccountable. The first formal treatment of the paragraph in a treatise on English Composition occurs in Bain's *Manual of English Composition and Rhetoric*, published in 1866. Yet the subject was slow in finding its way into text-books; even now only a small number of text-books contain an adequate treatment of it, although for more than a century paragraphs have been written that in every respect serve as models to the student of to-day. Writers so unlike in character and in style as Burke and Irving are alike in excellence of paragraph structure.

By a natural reaction from this neglect, the paragraph plays an important part in the rhetorical teaching of to-day; indeed, as I have already intimated, there is some danger of its becoming a fad. In no text-book on rhetoric has the paragraph ever been pushed into such prominence as in that of Professor Hart. In Professor Hill's book, on the other hand, the subject is reduced to very small dimensions; it is not mentioned until page 230 is reached, and the treatment is confined to eight pages, nearly five of which are made up of examples. The discussion is excellent, for Professor Hill has, to an enviable degree, the faculty of packing much thought into few words. In his elementary book, *The Foundations of Rhetoric* (published in 1892), twenty pages are given to the paragraph; otherwise one might suspect that it is with reluctance that Professor Hill has allowed himself to be drawn into the current. While his judgment may lead him to resist a tendency which is perhaps carried too far, yet his treatment of the subject is scarcely adequate, and will need to be supplemented and re-enforced by the teacher. By the laws of proportion,—discussed by Professor Hill on page 240,—eight pages, out of a total of four hundred, are insufficient for a just treatment of so important a topic; for it may safely be affirmed that one

who can write a good paragraph has, to a great extent, mastered the art of writing well.

Perhaps the amount of space given to the topic by Professor Hart (forty pages out of the two hundred strictly devoted to rhetoric) is unduly large; but this consideration is of slight importance in comparison with the question whether it is wise to begin instruction with the paragraph. In a course of only three months, in which a large amount of writing must be done as speedily as possible, and in which a few significant features must be emphasized to the exclusion of others of less importance, one might have little hesitation about following the plan proposed by Professor Hart; but in the course of two years for which he has made provision, such haste seems scarcely necessary. The ability to write good paragraphs implies the ability to write well-framed sentences in well-chosen words; and if diction and sentence structure have not been considered, it is scarcely possible to confine one's criticism to violations of the principles of paragraph structure. A general assault all along the line may sometimes be necessary; but a gradual approach, covered by sharpshooters, is usually the wiser method of attack.

Professor Hill's view as to the province of Rhetoric apparently does not permit him to give any heed to the time-honored division of the subject into Style and Invention. Rhetoric he regards as the art of expression, and all that can appropriately be treated under the rubric of style he sets forth in admirable shape. Professor Hart maintains the traditional division, though with the addition of new material. Thus the paragraph, which in Professor Genung's excellent treatment is included under Style, is placed by Professor Hart under Invention. As a matter of fact, the paragraph is so large a unit of discourse as to necessitate treatment under both style and invention; for this reason it is well suited to serve as a transition between the two divisions.

"Invention," says Professor Hart, "does not consist in finding out what to say; as a rhetorical process, it is the art of putting together what one has to say upon a subject." Under this heading he discusses the following

topics:—the Paragraph, Narration, Description, Exposition, and Argumentation; topics that Professor Hill finds it necessary to discuss, whatever may be his theory as to the province of rhetoric. A useful chapter is that of Professor Hart's on "Preparing a Composition," which treats of formulating the subject and of constructing a working plan or outline of the discourse; strangely enough, this chapter is not included in Part I, which treats of Invention. The average pupil is not inclined to undertake the labor of constructing an outline, even though the device is commonly practiced by experienced writers, and is directly helpful in the attainment of clearness, force, ease, and unity. Professor Hill does not touch upon this very important topic; apparently he does not regard it as falling within the province of rhetoric. Undoubtedly, like Argumentation and Exposition, it falls in part within the domain of logic. Yet it may fairly be asked: Who, if not the teacher of rhetoric, is to instruct the student in this very important topic, which he is so prone to neglect? If the text-book fails to treat of the subject, the deficiency must be made good by the teacher. It should be added that both books, Professor Hart's more explicitly, Professor Hill's more subtly, emphasize the importance of proportion and of structure. It might, perhaps, be objected that Professor Hart's chapters on the paragraph and on the construction of an outline are so formal in their treatment as to lead to a mechanical habit of writing on the part of the pupil; but such a criticism will scarcely be made by the teacher who knows how direct and explicit instruction in these matters is needed by the average undergraduate student.

For Elegance, which for seventeen years has held the third place in the trio of rhetorical virtues, Professor Hill has substituted the term Ease. It is difficult to decide upon a term which shall connote all the qualities that are intended to supplement Clearness and Force. Professor Hill says (p. 132) that ease is "the quality which makes language agreeable," and apparently implies that in order to be agreeable, language must be euphonious. That verse need not be invariably euphonious is generally admitted; and one would hesitate

to say that prose which is fittingly vigorous and concise is lacking in any quality that is appropriate. Since the publication of Professor Wendell's lectures on *English Composition*, there has been a disposition to broaden the meaning of the term elegance (perhaps, rather to re-establish the literal signification of the term), so that it may connote language that is as perfectly adapted as possible to the thought, be the expression harsh or euphonious. Elegance is thus understood to be the quality which satisfies the taste, and which, accordingly, demands a close correspondence between language and thought. Propriety might seem to be the term best suited to convey this meaning, were it not that the term is commonly restricted to mean accuracy in the use of words. Indeed, Professor Hart's treatment of the fundamental qualities of style is divided into Clearness, Force, and Propriety, though the last term is made to include both purity of diction and euphony.

The conservatism of the one writer, the progressiveness of the other,—radicalism, some will call it,—appear in matters of detail, such as the choice of words. Thus the use as verbs of *suicide*, *deed*, *referee*, *cable*, *wire*, is frowned upon by Professor Hill, is defended by Professor Hart. Of the so-called cleft infinitive Professor Hill says (p. 69):—"Although there is a growing tendency to use this construction, careful writers avoid it." Professor Hart says (p. 171):—"There seems to be no valid objection to the moderate use of the cleft infinitive, especially if the adverbial expression be short and simple." The latter writer has the courage of his convictions; for example, "to first study" (p. 251), "to truly know" (p. 263), "to logically convince" (p. 315). Evidently, those whose ears are offended by the construction may soon be a hopeless minority. Much as I dislike the construction, I cannot feel justified in waging open warfare upon it, or in doing more than to warn pupils against using it carelessly and unintelligently; indeed, in the expression "enough to more than justify," used recently in an address, I am not disposed to suggest any alteration.

One might question the wisdom of inserting in the body of the text remarks to teachers, such as are occasionally to be found in Pro-

fessor Hart's book. The principal criticism to be made, however, is that the author has undertaken too much. Indeed, he frankly admits (p. 263) that the function of the book is strictly at an end with Part III. Part IV contains a chapter on Poetry, one on Metre, one on Oratory and Debate (with a slightly modified treatment this chapter might have been included in Part I), and one on the History of the English Language. In this attempt at comprehensiveness, the earlier book is followed; and these features will doubtless help to win acceptance for the new book in some quarters. The writer says that it has been his "endeavor to make the book *available both for school and for college*" (italics are the writer's). In this difficult undertaking he has, perhaps, succeeded as well as any one could succeed; the book will meet the needs of many schools and of some colleges. The more advanced treatment of Professor Hill's book is better suited to students who have some maturity of mind, and who have had a good elementary training in English Composition.

HERBERT EVELETH GREENE.

Johns Hopkins University.

CORRESPONDENCE.

MIRACLE PLAYS.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—In your issue for February, Prof. E. G. Bourne makes the following rather remarkable statement, with reference to the earliest presentation of miracle plays:

"So far as I have noticed, the historians of the drama do not find positive proof of the presentation of miracle plays earlier than the thirteenth century."

Now, Prof. Bourne must surely have overlooked at least three of the best and best known authorities on this subject. By referring to either Klein,¹ or ten Brink,² or Creizenach³ he could easily have found the most positive proof of their earlier presentation among several of the

¹ *Geschichte des Dramas*, iii-iv, Leipzig, 1866, 1874.

² *Geschichte der englischen Litteratur*, ii, Strassburg, 1893.

³ *Geschichte des neueren Dramas*, i, Halle, 1893.

leading nations of that era, but, of course, *not in Italy*. Prof. Bourne seems to be under the impression that modern historians of the drama consider Italy the home of miracle plays or of *geistliche Spiele* in general! Of course, it is mere presumption in me to call attention to the fact, well known to all who are acquainted with the historical development of the modern drama, that Italy stands probably fourth in chronological order in the development and presentation of miracle and mystery plays. However, I hope I may be pardoned for giving a few passages here from the authors mentioned above, which bear directly on the point in question.

But, first, as to "Bishop Liutprand's narrative of his embassy to Constantinople in 968," Creizenach says (p. 355 f.):

"Auch aus dem Gebiete des oströmischen Reiches hat sich kein einziges Werk erhalten, das als geistliches Drama im eigentlichen Sinne des Wortes zu bezeichnen wäre. Doch scheint es, dass auch dort mitunter Aufführungen von geistlichen Dramen in der Kirche stattfanden. Ausführlichere Bericht über solche Dramen sind, soviel ich weiss, nicht vorhanden."

In a foot-note (p. 356) to the last sentence he remarks:

"Wenn Liutprand in dem Berichte über seine Gesandtschaftsreise 968 erzählt, dass die Griechen am 20. Juli die Himmelfahrt des Elias mit scenischen Spielen feierten (*Monumenta Germ. Scriptt.* 3, 353 f.), so geht aus seinen Worten nicht mit Bestimmtheit hervor, dass er Aufführungen in der Kirche meinte."

In regard to "religious plays" in Greek literature, Creizenach says further in this connection (p. 356, and note 2):

"Die geistlichen Dichtungen in dialogischer Form welche die mittelgriechische Litteratur aufzuweisen hat, sind ohne Zweifel als Buchdramen zu betrachten. Das eine die *Τριχοι εις τον Αδαμ* des Diakons Ignatios (c. 820) behandelt im 143 Trimeter den Sündenfall. Das andere, der leidende Christus (*Χριστός πάσχων*), von einem unbekannten Dichter wahrscheinlich im 11. oder 12. Jahrhundert verfasst, ist eine geschmacklose Künstelei⁴ Vgl. zu dem Obigen die Darstellung in Krumbachers *Geschichte der byzantinischen Litteratur*. München, 1891; besonders S. 296, 348, 356 ff. Sathas, hat eine ausführliche Monographie

⁴ For a detailed description of this piece, cf. Klein, iii, 599 ff

über das byzantinische Theater verfasst (*Ἱστορικὸν δοκίμιον περὶ τοῦ θεάτρον καὶ τῆς μουσικῆς τῶν Βυζαντινῶν*, Venedig, 1879), die indes, wie Krumbacher mit Recht bemerkt, den Leser nur in dem Glauben an die Dramenlosigkeit der byzantinischen Zeit bestärken kann.⁵

As to the origin of *geistliche Spiele*, we find the following in Klein, iv, p. 12. Cf. Creizenach, p. 47 f.

"Als die ältesten gottesdienstlichen, von Geistlichen in den Kirchen dialogisch recitirten u. gesungenen Mysteriendramen gelten bis jetzt die vier, nebst noch sechs andern, von Monmerqué für die Gesellschaft der Bibliophilen herausgegebenen Mysterien aus dem 11. Jahrhundert, in lateinischer Sprache: Die Mysterie von den Magiern; vom Betlehemit. Kindermord; von der Auferstehung, und die von der Erscheinung in Emaus."

Further on p. 14 Klein, in speaking of Miracle plays in the strict sense, says:

"Um zwei Jahrhundert mindesten gehen die aus der heiligen Legende entsprossenen *Mirakelspiele* den bekannt frühesten Mysteriendramen voran. Schon das 10. Jahrh. hat uns in dem Wunder- und Bekehrungsspiel der Nonne Hroswitha diese Dramengattung in ihrer vollen Blüthe gezeigt; als eine classische Nachblüthe und als die Schlüsselblumen zugleich des künftigen Mirakelflors. Das nach Hroswitha's Legendendramen nächstälteste Mirakelspiel von der heil. Catharina, das jener, nach England an die Klosterschule von Saint-Alban berufene Godofredus aus der Normandie zu Dunstaple in anglo-normännischer (französischer) Sprache verfasste und daselbst von seinen Schülern aufführen liess, fällt in den Anfang des 12. Jahrh. (1110). . . . Doch war Geoffroy's (Godsfredus) Mirakelspiel von der heil. Catharina keineswegs das erste in England. Vielmehr wurden den Guilelmus Stephens zu folge, welcher ein halbes Jahrh. vor Math. Paris schrieb, schon vor Geoffroy's Mirakel der heil. Catharina dergleichen Spiel aus dem Leben der Heiligen, aber allem Anscheine nach, in lateinischer Sprache dargestellt."⁶

Creizenach has given in Book ii of vol. i, a very interesting and exhaustive description of the origin and development of these plays in France, beginning with the eleventh century. Moreover, Davidson⁷ has not only made a very interesting and thorough study of religious plays of all sorts, tracing their his-

⁵ Cf. also Morley, *English Writers*, iii, p. 104 f. London, 1895. Creizenach, i, p. 157 f.; ten Brink, p. 247 f.

⁶ *Studies in the English Mystery Plays*, by Charles Davidson. Yale University, 1892.

torical development among different peoples, but he has also reprinted three of these plays in part; namely, the *Freising* (Tenth century), *Orléans* (Twelfth century) and *Rouen* (Fourteenth century).⁷

Ten Brink says⁸ with regard to the early presentation of miracle plays in England:

"In der zweiten Hälfte des zwölften Jahrhunderts begann man in England Mirakelspiele auch öffentlich vor allem Volk aufzuführen."

Klein, ten Brink and Creizenach all show quite conclusively that these plays, originating in France, were thence transplanted into England, Germany, Spain, and Italy, and that, too, mainly through the medium of the Roman Catholic Church. They are first heard of in Italy, as Prof. Bourne quoting Ebert correctly says, in 1244,⁹ in Spain, but only in their oldest and simplest form, in the eleventh century.¹⁰ There are very few remains of *mittelalterlich gerstlichen Dramas* in Scandinavian literature. Nevertheless says Creizenach (p. 350),

"hat sich ein schwedisches Marienmirakel erhalten; die Handschrift wird in die zweite Hälfte des 14. Jahrhunderts gesetzt."

"Unter den slavischen Völkern sind die Czechen die einzigen, bei denen sich geistliche Spiele aus dem Mittelalter erhalten haben" (cf. p. 351 f.).

We thus see that the "interesting question" of the independent development of the miracle plays among different peoples has long since become a subject of consideration for historians of dramatic literature, and of these latter both Klein and Creizenach are of the opinion that these plays had their origin on French soil and spread thence principally through religious influence over all civilized Europe (cf. Creizenach, pp. 356-361).

WM. H. HULME.

Western Reserve University.

GERMAN w- INTO FRENCH gu-.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—The fact is generally acknowledged

⁷ Cf. Davidson, p. 247.

⁸ P. 247.

⁹ Creizenach, p. 300.

¹⁰ Creiz., p. 346.

that phonetic changes are due for the most part to imperfect imitation on the part of a speaker when he attempts to enunciate a new sound. The development treated in the accompanying note is an illustration of this principle. It is well known that since the French speech-system possessed no element corresponding to the German *w*, the effort was successfully made to approximate the bilabial nature of the sound by prefixing to the latter a *g*. Hence WAD>, gué, WERRA> *guerre*, WARNJAN> *guarnir*, etc. This statement is undoubtedly correct. The question may arise, however: Why should *g* have been chosen in preference to other consonants (notably the labials) which, when placed before the *w* would have served equally well to facilitate its pronunciation? I have not found this query asked or answered in any of the bibliography at my disposal, and, in lieu of the lack of information on the point, I offer the following suggestion, the simplicity of which forms its chief claim to consideration.

The combination of an initial consonant followed by a half-vocalic *u* existed in French before the importation into the latter language of any German words. This combination derived from Latin *qu-*, as in *quant*, *qualité*, *quel*, etc. Such words as these were doubtless in the minds of the French speakers at the time of the introduction of the German *w*, and in choosing a consonant to add to the latter, a *g* was naturally the first to occur to the Gauls, because not only would this *g* avail in preserving the German *w*, but a still stronger reason, perhaps, for selecting *g* was furnished by the fact that *qu-* formed a voiced combination corresponding to the voiceless *qu-* and thus satisfied the well-known phonetic tendency in language that gives us corresponding voiced and voiceless combinations.

Another phonetic reason that influenced the selection of *qu* by the side of this *qu* may have been the following: The French of today are unable to reproduce the bilabial *w* which English-speaking people use; they replace this *w* by a half-vocalic *u*, very noticeable in words borrowed from the English; as, *tramway*, which in the Parisian pronunciation, is generally modified to *tramoué*. The same difficulty in imitation may have been encountered

at the time of the adoption of the German *w*. The *u* of Latin *qu-* was doubtless given a half-vocalic value in Gaul; consequently Gauls were predisposed to hear the German *w* as half-consonantal. In the endeavor to fix this sound by placing before it a consonant, a *g* may have been suggested, not only from analogy to *qu-*, but because for the formation of the *u* the back portion of the tongue was raised very near the section of the palate where a *g* was formed, and only a little further approach toward this section sufficed to produce the *g*.

L. EMIL MENDER.

Johns Hopkins University.

RAPHAEL'S POESY AND POESY IN FAUST.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—Since the publication of my article on *Raphael's Poesy and Poesy in Faust* in your February issue, I have received some lines from Dr. A. Fresenius of the *Goethe Archiv* in Weimar that may interest your readers. In the first place, he communicates to me the following note from Dr. C. Ruland, director of the Goethe-National-Museum:

Goethe besass von Raphael's *Poesie*

- (1) eine kleine leidlich unbedeutende Copie in Öl, die im Urbino-Zimmer hängt;
- (2) eine sehr schöne grosse Zeichnung des Kopfes allein von W. Tischbein (liegt in den Mappen der Sammlung der Handzeichnungen).

In the second place, he calls attention to the frequent mention of Raphael's *Poesy* by Goethe's friend and collaborator, Heinrich Meyer in the *Propyläen*.¹

While this information further specifies and corroborates my assumption of Goethe's thorough familiarity with Raphael's *Poesy*, it tends to show, at the same time, that the use I suppose him to have made of it was thoroughly original.

In conclusion, permit me to avail myself of this chance to correct a misprint which has crept into my article. Col. 112, l. 20, read *Schroeter* instead of 'Schroeder.'

A. GERBER.

Earlham College.

¹ Bd. i, Stück 1, pp. 110, 111, 112; Stück 2, pp. 113, 130, 148.

JOURNAL NOTICES.

ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR ROMANISCHE PHILOGIE. Herausgegeben von Dr. Gustav Gröber. XIX. BAND (1895), I. U. 2. HEFT.—*Contents:* Priebisch, J., Altspanische Glossen.—Crescini, V.—Bios, A., Un Frammento Provenzale a Conegliano.—Cohn, G., Zum Ursprunge von *abo(s)mé*.—Marchot, P., Encore la Question de *arius*.—Hornig, A., *Fr. gesse; faire*.—Liebermann, F., Eine Anglonormannische Uebersetzung des 12. Jahrhunderts von *Articuli Willelmi, Leges Edwardi* und *Genealogia Normannorum*.—Ulrich, J., Eine Allothringische Uebersetzung des *Dionysius Cato*.—Becker, Ph. Aug., Eine Unbeachtete Ausgabe von Jean Lemaire *Temple d'Honneur et de Vertu*.—Meyer-Luehke, W., Etymologien.—Marchot, P., *Étymologies Françaises et Dialectales*.—Hornig, A., Französische Etymologien.—Suchier, H., Bagatelle.—Weymann, C. *guamente*.—Foerster, W., *Altfrz. mes*.—Rollin, G., *Aliscans* (bespr. Ph. Aug. Becker).—Huguet, Étude sur la Syntaxe de Rabelais (bespr. H. Schneegans).—Zeitschriften, u. s. W.—Gessner, E., Das Spanische Indefinite Pronomen.—Hornig, A., Die Suffice *accus, accus-accus* im Französischen.—Fuhrken, G. E., *De David li Prophecie*.—Ulrich, J., *Fiore di Virtù*.—Becker, Ph. Aug., Nachrichten zu Jean Lemaire.—Stiefel, A. L., Calderons Lustspiel *La Dama Duende* und Seine Quelle.—Stiefel, A. L., Eine Deutsche Parallele zum Italienischen und Englischen Mysterium über die Verheerung der Hölle.—Settegast, F., Die Bildung der 1. Pl. Prs. Ind. im Galloromanischen, Vorzüglich im Französischen.—Barad, J., Romanische Etymologien.—Meyer-Luehke, W., Romanische Etymologien.—Philippide, Alexandru, *Istoria Limbi*, vol. I (bespr. Th. Gartner).—Francesco-Flamini, Studi di Storia Letteraria Italiana e Straniera (bespr. R. Renier).—Zeitschriften.

LITERATURBLATT FÜR GERMANISCHE UND ROMANISCHE PHILOGIE. Herausgegeben von Otto Behagel und Fritz Neumann. XVI. JAHRGANG (1895), NR. 1-3. *Contents:* Vahlen, J., Lachmanns Briefe an Haupt, hsg. von, (O. Behagel).—Jiriczek, O. L., Die Bösa-Saga in Zwei Fassungen, Nebst Proben aus den Bösa-Rimur (W. Gölther).—von Biedermann, W., Goethes Gespräche (H. Lambel).—Baechtold, J., Schweizerische Schauspiele des xvi. Jahrhunderts, Band III (L. Fränkel).—Tobler-Meyer, W., Deutsche Familiennamen nach ihrer Entstehung und Bedeutung, mit Besonderer Rücksichtnahme auf Zürich und die Ostschweiz (A. Socin).—Kahl, W., Mundart und Schriftsprache im Elsass (G. Binz).—Menges, H., Volksmundarten und Volksschule im Elsass (G. Binz).—Ferrell, C. U., Teutonic Antiquities in the Anglo-Saxon Genesis (G. Binz).—Ljunggren, C. A., The Poetical Gender of the Substantives in the Works of Ben Jonson (F. Holthausen).—Sudre, L., Les Sources du Roman de Renart (C. Voretzsch).—Bire, E., Victor Hugo Après 1852 (R. Mahrenholtz).—Cipolla, C., Il Trattato de Monarchia di Dante Alighieri e l'Oposcolo De Potestate Regia et Papali di Giovanni da Parigi (F. X. Kraus).—Cipolla, C., Di Alcuni Luoghi Autobiografici nella Divina Commedia (F. X. Kraus).—Tobler, A., Dante und Vier Deutsche Kaiser (F. X. Kraus).—Trenta, G., La Tomba di Arrigo VII Im-

peratore, con Documenti Inediti (F. X. Kraus).—Prou, M., Manuel de Paléographie Latine et Française du vie. au xvii. Siècle, Suivi d'un Dictionnaire des Abréviations, 2e éd., (Ed. Heyck).—Prou, M., Recueil de Facsimilés d'Écritures du xii. au xvii. Siècle, Accompagnés de Transcriptions (Ed. Heyck).—Zeitschriften, u. s. W.—Scherer, W., Kleine Schriften, Band I (O. Behagel).—Koezel, R., Geschichte der Deutschen Litteratur bis zum Ausgang des Mittelalters, Band I, Th. 1 (F. Kauffmann).—Schorbach, K., Die Historien von dem Ritter Beringer (J. Loubier).—Wolff, R., Untersuchung der Laute in den Kentischen Urkunden (G. Binz).—Vollmoeller und Otto, Kritischer Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte der Romanischen Philologie (R. Mahrenholtz).—Dupertuis, F., Recueil des Locutions Vicieuses les Plus Usitées dans le Canton de Vaud, recueillies et mises en ordre alphabétique, avec leur signification française (K. Sachs).—Novati, F., La Strage Cornetana del 1245 Narrata da un Poeta Contemporaneo (R. Wendriner).—Guarniero, F. E., Del Trattato de Sette Peccati Mortali in Dialecto Genovese Antico (R. Wendriner).—Gorra, E., Il Dialecto della Court d'Amours di Mahius li Porriers (R. Wendriner).—Mazzoni, G., Due Parole sul Disegno di Guido Cavalcanti (R. Wendriner).—Cipolla, C., Un Contributo alla Storia della Controversia Intorno all' Autenticità del Commento di Pietro Alighieri alla Divina Commedia (R. Wendriner).—Frati, L., Costumanze e Pompe Nuziali Bolognesi nel Medio Evo (R. Wendriner).—Parodi, E. G., Dal Tristano Veneto (R. Wendriner).—Papa, F., Alcune Rubriche della Prammatica Sopra il Vestire Promulgata dalla Repubblica Fiorentina nel 1384 (R. Wendriner).—Carlini, L., La Difesa di Pomponio Leto Pubblicata ed Illustrata (R. Wendriner).—Rosi, V., Un Elogio Volgare di Tito Vespasiano Strozzi (R. Wendriner).—Medin, A., Due Barzelette Relative alla Battaglia della Polesella, 23 Dicembre, 1509 (R. Wendriner).—Salvioni, C., Ancora del Cavassico; La Cantilena Bellunese del 1193 (R. Wendriner).—Renier, R., Dalla Corrispondenza di Guido Postumo Silvestri: Spigolature (R. Wendriner).—Frato, G., Alcune Rime di Giovanni Muzzarelli (R. Wendriner).—Flamini, F., Viaggi Fantastici e Trionfi di Poeti (R. Wendriner).—de Nohac, P., Pietro Bembo et Lazare de Balz (R. Wendriner).—Solerti, A., La Seconda Parte del Discorso Intorno alla Sedizione Nata nel Regno di Francia l'Anno 1585, di Torquato Tasso, per la prima volta data in luce (R. Wendriner).—Rui, G., I Testi e i Principi di Savoia; Note Sparse Raccolte da Documenti degli Archivi Torinesi (R. Wendriner).—Menghini, M., Le Lodi e Grandezze della Aguglia e Fontana di Piazza Navona, Canzonetta di Francesco Asclone (R. Wendriner).—Pelissier, L. G., Quelques Lettres des Amies de Huet (R. Wendriner).—Rugari, V., Re Gemshid nel Zabul (R. Wendriner).—Pitre, G., Ninne-Nanne Siciliane Inedite (R. Wendriner).—Bellorini, E., Ninne-Nanne e Cantilene Infantili Raccolte a Nuoro (R. Wendriner).—Nurra, P., Usi e Costumi Nuziali di Sardegna (R. Wendriner).—Bacci, O., Preghiere e Giuculatorie di Bambini che si Dicono in Valdesa (R. Wendriner).—Zeitschriften, u. s. W.—Hildebrand, H., Festgabe für Forschungen zur Deutschen Philologie (G. Ehrismann).—Rosenhagen, H., Daniel von dem Blühenden Tal (G. Ehrismann).—Hoffmann, H., Ein Nachahmer Hermanns von Sachsenheim (H. Wunderlich).—Hewitt, W. T., Goethes Hermann und Dorothea (J. Collin).—Breul, K., Schillers Wilhelm Tell (J. Collin).—Breul, K., Schillers Geschichte des Dreijährigen Krieges (J. Collin).—Goslin, P. C., Aanteekeningen op den Bowulf (F. Holthausen).—Jenkins, T. A., L'Espurgatoire Saint Patriz of Marie de France (K. Warnke).—Jeanroy et Teulie, Mystères Provençaux du Quinzième Siècle (E. Levy).—Cesario, G. A., La Poesia Siciliana Sotta gli Svevi (Berthold Wiese).—Weigand, H., Erster Jahresbericht des Instituts für Rumänische Sprache zu Leipzig (W. Meyer-Lübke).—Zeitschriften, u. s. W.